

3203











SEVEN LECTURES

SCRIPTURE AND SCIENCE.

●BY

JOHN ELIOT HOWARD, F.L.S., ETC.

LONDON:  
GROOMBRIDGE AND SONS,  
PATERNOSTER ROW.

MDCCCLXV.

EMMILL, PRINTER, LONDON.

## DEDICATION AND INTRODUCTION.



To the kind friends who patiently listened to the delivery of these Lectures this volume is dedicated. It is the reproduction of notes taken at the time, but not excluding such alterations and additions as it seemed expedient should be made, in order to publication to a wider circle.

This notice must be my apology for any negligence of style resulting from the circumstance first mentioned, or for any discrepancy in the mode of expressing my thoughts arising from the contrast between the spoken portions and those which may have been more carefully elaborated afterwards. Should it happen to me, as it did to one of my acquaintance, to have a duality of authorship ascribed to my production, I beg to assure all my readers that the writer is one and indivisible, and that there is neither more nor less occasion for such a supposition in reference to this humble volume than there is to imagine two different authors of the book of Isaiah, or six or seven persons engaged in the forgery of the books of Moses.

It will be seen that I regret the antagonism between revelation and science, the result of human imperfection, and pride, and dogmatism, from which

it can scarcely be supposed the champions on either side are exempt; but I have no desire to promote a barren and fruitless compromise between their claims. As I am the implicit follower of no one, and have not the opportunity of falling back upon denominational or conventional support, it is highly probable that my sentiments may meet with hostile criticism. If such remarks are from anonymous assailants, I shall not hold myself responsible to answer them. If otherwise, I hope to be enabled to assign fuller reasons for any sentiment to which I may have given utterance, or to correct any mistake which may be pointed out; as I would desire every reader who knows any subject more correctly than I do to impart with candour his superior store of information, and if not, to share with me in those views which I find good and profitable.\*

In conclusion, I commend these pages to the blessing of Him with whom is no variableness nor shadow of turning, together with my earnest desire that they may be useful to thoughtful and inquiring minds in their pursuit of that wisdom which is better than rubies, and to which all the things that may be desired are not to be compared.

JOHN ELIOT HOWARD.

TOTTENHAM, 1865.

\* "Si quid novisti rectius istis

Candidus imperti, si non his utere mecum."

# CONTENTS.

---

## LECTURE I.

	PAGE
THE SCRIPTURES VIEWED AS THE ORACLES OF GOD .....	1

## LECTURE II.

THE BOOKS OF THE OLD TESTAMENT, AND THEIR AUTHORSHIP .....	34
--	----

## LECTURE III.

THE NEW TESTAMENT—ITS AUTHORITY AND AUTHORSHIP	54
--	----

## LECTURE IV.

COLENSO AND HIS DIFFICULTIES .....	84
------------------------------------	----

## LECTURE V.

THE SIX DAYS OF CREATION, AS GIVEN IN THE BOOK OF GENESIS .....	121
---	-----

## LECTURE VI.

	PAGE
THE LAWS OF NATURE AND MIRACLES.....	153

## LECTURE VII.

MYSTICISM AS OPPOSED TO THE REVELATION OF GOD IN SCRIPTURE .....	181
APPENDIX .....	210

# SEVEN LECTURES ON SCRIPTURE AND SCIENCE.

---

## LECTURE I.

### THE SCRIPTURES VIEWED AS THE ORACLES OF GOD.

THE subject I have chosen for this evening's lecture is intended for the help of thoughtful and inquiring minds. It is "The Scriptures Viewed as the Oracles of God." I would desire to look at this question first from the point from which a person would regard it who as yet is unacquainted experimentally with practical Christianity. There are many minds which have not really settled the question, whether there are any oracles of God at all. Nevertheless, all must feel that man, placed as he is, in a world full of temptations, change, and snares, for a little season, and soon to depart to an unknown future, would be the most miserable of all creatures had not God in some way been pleased to make Himself known unto him. That some such revelation of Himself has been made, is the necessary sequence and logical deduction from the contempla-



## 2 THE SCRIPTURES VIEWED AS THE ORACLES OF GOD.

tion of the power, and wisdom, and beneficence of God as displayed to us in his creation; and we must also conclude, on similar grounds, that the one revelation of God which is truly worthy of Himself and truly beneficial to mankind is the Christian religion, including as its foundation the Jewish substructure.

Now, both the Jewish and the Christian religions present us with written oracles of God—oracles intrusted to the keeping of those who profess those religions, authenticated by miracles, and especially by the standing miracle of their effect on those who truly receive their teaching, and both in the one case and in the other containing in themselves such glorious attestations of the being, the character, and the goodness of God, and such remarkable prophecies, amongst others, of the dereliction of duty and failure even of those to whom the care of these oracles was intrusted, as must at once claim the attention even of the most thoughtless mind.

But the point to which I now come, as regards, in the first place, the authority of the Old Testament Scriptures, is connected with the attestation of their divine origin\* given by our blessed Saviour Himself—an authentication which must be paramount to every one who agrees with what I have been saying as to the divine origin of the

Christian religion. The authority of Christ, who was WISDOM'S self from eternity in the bosom of the Father,—the Word who was in the beginning with God, and was God—who was made flesh, and yet claimed to be on earth, “the Son of Man who is in heaven,” to speak the words given, to Him by the Father, and even to be one with the Father,—his authority in a point like this must, to a Christian, be above all things pre-eminent.

When we come to look at the life of our Saviour as recorded in the gospel, we find that it was his custom to recognize *the Scriptures* in his usual attendance in the synagogue\* in the book that was then presented to Him, which on occasion He opened and expounded. That book He clearly sanctioned with impressive solemnity as the one thing to which it was important to the eternal destiny of man to listen. “If they hear not Moses and the prophets,”† He said, “neither will they be persuaded though one rose from the dead.” It was by this Word that He repelled the tempter in his advances, as we read in Luke iv.; He considered it as the Word of his Father, and consequently the guide of his life, so that it was sufficient for Him to quote the book of Deuteronomy with an “It is written” to meet from the same portion of the law the destroyer who would have turned him aside. And after his resurrection

\* Luke iv. 17.

† Luke xxix. 31.

we read, in Luke xxiv. 29, that, "beginning at Moses and all the prophets, He expounded to them in all the Scriptures, the things concerning Himself." Afterwards, when He appeared to the eleven, He said, "These are the words which I spake to you when I was yet with you, that all things must be fulfilled that are written in the law and in the prophets and in the psalms concerning Me." We find clearly that Jesus sanctioned the Jewish canon of Scriptures, by his full personal authority, as they then existed and as they were then read in the synagogues. He refers to the law as the writings of Moses, and as the divinely sanctioned credentials of his own mission, for He says, "Do not think that I will accuse you to the Father: there is one that accuseth you, even Moses, in whom ye trust. *For had ye believed Moses, ye would have believed Me: for he wrote of Me.* But if ye believe not his writings, how shall ye believe my words?"\* He declared that "the Scripture cannot be broken," and He said this in reference to a quotation from the eighty-second Psalm,† showing the extension of this authorization of the Jewish canon to a portion different to that which we have considered in the previous quotation. Again, in the sermon on the Mount,‡ He says, "Think not that I am come to destroy the law, or

\* John v. 45—47.

† John x. 34; Ps. lxxxii. 6.

‡ Matt. v. 17.

the prophets: I am not come to destroy, but to fulfil. For verily, I say unto you, 'Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled.'" It is clear, then, that before a Christian can feel at liberty to exercise his critical powers in setting aside any portion of the law or the prophets as not Scripture, he ought to reflect that the question has been *already* authoritatively settled by his Master, and that the words of the Father being those which our Lord claimed to speak, and the Holy Ghost being claimed as the Inspirer of the Scriptures, the authority of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost is pledged to the Old Testament Scripture as the oracles of God. And we cannot disallow this claim without overthrowing entirely all the personal authority of our blessed Lord, not only as being Himself divine, but even as to his being approved of God the Father. This very serious consequence of denying the divine authority of the Old Testament I wish to put before you very early in these considerations, in order to place distinctly on record the point from which I start. Having, in my own mind, come clearly to this conclusion—speaking now simply as regards intellectual conviction—that Christianity is the true religion from God, and that Christ is the true Saviour; that He is the Prophet to whom I must listen—the Prophet predicted long ago by Moses;—

I therefore take upon *his* authority these Old Testament Scriptures as part of the oracles of God ; and I cast any doubts, difficulties, hesitations, questions, that might arise as to those Scriptures at the feet of my Lord, without expecting to see them all solved in this present state of existence. I confess that I am not at liberty to exercise my natural reason in rejecting this portion and retaining that, in reference to what, as a whole, has been sanctioned by Christ himself.

In the next place, I pass on to another consideration which I think very important—the way in which the Scriptures came to us. That mode is very peculiar, that is to say, it is connected with the history of the Jews as the living witnesses to the truth of Jehovah, and to a great extent it evolves itself out of the history of those witnesses. It has not pleased God, in all ages, primarily and chiefly to reveal Himself by the means of written revelations ; and, therefore, though at this present time we refer at once to “THE BOOK,” and are right in doing so, yet we must remember that God’s first way of manifesting Himself was personally, and, as we may say, for it is so represented to us, *visibly and audibly*. Unquestionably, God spake directly to Adam, and subsequently, as we read in the Hebrews, at sundry times and in divers manners spake to our fathers by the prophets, all leading up to the great revelation

of God, the great manifestation of God in the person of his Son, whose name is called "the Word of God." Now the Bible is *the Book* in a pre-eminent sense; the term Bible means *the Book*, as *the Scriptures* mean "*the things written*," and it grows out of and is connected with the dealings of God with his chosen witnesses, to whom He gave his Holy Spirit. And the connection of the Bible with the living witnesses for God, and again with the gift of the Holy Ghost, has never been broken; so that these three go together; first, *the Holy Spirit*, in connection with (secondly) those who stand in every age as *living witnesses* for God, and (thirdly) *the divinely-inspired Scripture*, connected with their testimony. See the importance of this as to the way in which the Bible is sometimes criticized by merely intellectual men, without any reverence for God, or any claim, or thought even, of asking God for the guidance of his Holy Spirit, as if there was no connection between the Book and the living witnesses in possession of the Spirit, and, consequently, no need of illumination from above to understand it. You will, also, if you carry out these thoughts, see the importance of these principles in reference to the way in which the testimony of God is to be carried to all nations. The Bible is to go forth in connection with the missionary or the evangelist, the living witness, the true servant of

God, who, having the help of the blessed Spirit to preach the gospel, and to expound the Scriptures, is to carry forward his witness in the way that God has from the beginning appointed. I do not, of course, in saying this, put a limitation on the power of God. He may, and He does, many a time make the mere Book the witness for Him, and dispenses with human instrumentality. I am speaking of the way which He has from the beginning appointed—living witnesses, helped by his living Spirit, and provided with the Scriptures as the depository of the truth they preach.

God made Himself personally known to Adam. He heard the voice of Jehovah Elohim in the garden in the cool of the day, as we read in Gen. iii. Again, God spake to Noah, and gave him the prophetic spirit. Jehovah spake to Abraham audibly and visibly, I *suppose* in the person of the pre-existent Word, but *certainly* audibly and visibly; and He chose the seed of Abraham, his friend, for his peculiar possession, for in his seed all the nations of the earth were to be blessed, and our Lord assures us that "salvation is of the Jews." Isaac and Jacob were similarly favoured, and, again, when God looked upon his people Israel, and said that He would bring them out of Egypt, the angel of Jehovah—again I presume Christ pre-existent—appeared as a flame of fire, and the Lord spake

unto Moses apparently, not in dark images, and “the similitude of Jehovah” did he behold.\*

I must turn your attention, in connection with this, to the forty-first, forty-second, and forty-third chapters of Isaiah, in which you will see the Lord summoning all the earth to judgment.† “Keep silence before me, O islands; and let the people renew their strength: let them come near; then let them speak: let us come near together to judgment.” Yet more clearly in chapter xliii. 9: “Let all the nations be gathered together, and let the people be assembled: who among them can declare this, and show us former things? let them bring forth *their witnesses*, that they may be justified: or let them hear, and say, It is truth.” The Lord having thus constituted this great Court of Appeal, calls into the court Israel his servant.‡ “But thou, Israel, art my servant, Jacob whom I have chosen, the seed of Abraham my friend. Thou whom I have taken from the ends of the earth, and called thee from the chief men thereof, and said unto thee, Thou art my servant; I have chosen thee, and not cast thee away.” And further:§ “*Produce your cause*, saith Jehovah; bring forth your strong reasons, saith the King of Jacob. Let them (the idolaters) bring them forth, *and show us what shall*

\* Read in Num. xii. 8.

† Isa. xli. 1.

‡ Isa. lxi. 8.

§ Isa. xli. 21.



*happen* : let them show the former things, what they be, that we may consider them, and know the latter end of them ; or declare us things for to come. Show the things that are to come hereafter, *that we may know that ye are gods* ; yea, do good, or do evil, that we may be dismayed, and behold it together. Behold, ye are of *nothing*, and your work of *nought* : an abomination is he that chooseth you.” Having thus shown the vanity of the idols and of idolaters, Jehovah says,\* “I have raised up one (Cyrus) from the north, and he shall come : from the rising of the sun shall he call upon my name : and he shall come upon princes as upon mortar, and as the potter treadeth clay. Who hath declared from the beginning, that we may know ? and beforetime, that (וְאִמְרֵי צִדִּיק) we may say, It is true ! yea, there is none that sheweth, yea, there is none that declareth, yea, there is none that heareth your words.” That is, all the idolatrous nations, and all their soothsayers and diviners, have failed to predict that which Jehovah foretold to his own nation ; and He brings that nation, as the depositaries of the revelation, into the Court of the universe, as it were, to show that Jehovah is the true God revealing it. Verse 27, the next verse, should read, “I the first say to Zion, Behold, behold them : and I will give to Jerusalem one that

\* Isa. xli. 25.

bringeth good tidings. For I beheld, and there was no man ; even among them, and there was no counsellor, that, when I asked of them, could answer a word. *Behold they are all vanity ; their works are nothing : their molten images are wind and confusion.*" Attention is now claimed to the Messiah, the Anointed One, as THE SERVANT on whom the Spirit should rest.\* " Behold my servant, whom I uphold ; mine elect, in whom my soul delighteth ; *I have put my spirit upon him : he shall bring forth judgment to the nations. . . . I am Jehovah : that is my name : and my glory will I not give to another (the Servant being also the Son, and one with the Father) neither my praise to graven images.* Behold, the former things are come to pass, and new things do I declare : before they spring forth I tell you of them." And then passing over to chapter xliii. 10, we read : "*Ye are my witnesses, saith Jehovah, AND my servant whom I have chosen.*" That is clearly the servant spoken of in the first verse of the forty-second chapter—the Lord Christ. You see, in the first place, the nation stand before you as the witnesses for Jehovah, then enfolded in this nation, the one Israelite,† the one true servant of Jehovah, the one true vine in contrast with the false vine ; the one who Jehovah says " shall not fail nor be dis-

\* Isa. xlii. 1.

† Called, therefore, Israel, xlix. 3.

couraged." Mark the connection between these two. "Ye are my witnesses, *and the servant* whom I have chosen." This is the chosen servant of whom Jehovah declares in the fifty-second chapter, "Behold, my servant shall deal prudently, he shall be exalted and extolled, and be very high." Yet so completely is he identified with the body of chosen witnesses, that since they are constrained to say, "All we like sheep have gone astray; we have turned every one to his own way," nevertheless in Him they can rejoice, for, "Jehovah hath laid on him the iniquity of us all." Of Him "it is exacted and he is made answerable,\* yet he opened not his mouth." "By the knowledge of him shall my righteous servant justify many; for he shall bear their iniquities." All *believers* are also witnesses and servants, and justified through the Righteous Servant, by whose "stripes they are healed."† There is the connection again of the living witnesses, so that the nation of witnesses failing, Jehovah is well pleased nevertheless for his righteousness' sake; and there is the witness of the living Spirit, the Holy Spirit resting without measure on the Lord Jesus Christ personally, as the witness for Jehovah upon earth, and all this secured by special covenant promise in Isaiah lix. 21. "As for me, this is my covenant with them, saith Jehovah; My *spirit* that is upon thee,

\* עָנָה וְהָיָה נֶפֶשׁ Isa. liii. 7.

† See especially c. xliv. 21—23; also, c. xliii. 21, 25.

and my *words* which I have put in thy mouth, shall not depart out of thy mouth, nor out of the mouth of thy seed, nor out of the mouth of thy seed's seed, saith Jehovah, *from henceforth and for ever.*" The result of the great tribunal is this, "No weapon that is formed against thee shall prosper: and *every tongue that shall rise against thee in judgment thou shalt condemn.* This is the heritage of the servants of Jehovah, and their righteousness is of me, saith Jehovah." (See also c. lx. 1—3 and 21.) So much as to the witnesses; as to the glory of God, this shall extend over the whole earth, and He shall have this title, "the God of the whole earth shall he be called" (c. liv. 5), for "the Lord Jehovah shall slay thee, and call his servants by another name." (c. lxxv. 15). "So shall they fear the name of Jehovah from the west, and his glory from the rising of the sun" (c. lix. 19). As He says, "I am sought of them that asked not for me; I am found of them that sought me not" (c. lxxv.); and "he who blesseth himself in the earth, shall bless himself in the God AMEN," the *Covenant God* (c. lxxv. 16, compare Rev. iii. 14); that is, in the elect servant, Christ, in whom all the promises of God are yea and amen for ever.

The Old Testament Scriptures were therefore evolved by holy men of old, speaking as they were moved or "borne along" by the Holy Ghost, in

reference to the dealings of God with his chosen nation, not with the whole world, but with the chosen witnesses. All things from the beginning are given in reference to the history and polity of the Jewish race and nation, as the seed of Abraham, God's friend. The history of creation in seven days or periods has relation to the command to observe the Sabbath. The curse of Noah has allusion not to the enslavement of the negro race, who are not the posterity of Canaan at all, but clearly to the extirpation of the Canaanites by Israel. Again, the promise of the seed of the woman as the hope and desire of all nations was to take effect in the seed of Abraham, in the Son of David. Out of the fifty chapters of Genesis, thirty-eight are chiefly occupied with details of the formation of the witnesses for Jehovah. Exodus relates how God called his witnesses out of Egypt: "Israel was a child, and I loved him and called him out of Egypt;" Leviticus shows the embodying of the witnesses into a nationality; Numbers, their ordering; Deuteronomy is the repetition and completion of the law and the testimony; Joshua, the planting of the nation in the inheritance prepared for it. The first five books form more distinctly *the law*, so called in many places in Scripture, and, as I think, written on one roll of parchment, forming thus one book. This roll was then deposited in the sides of the ark; not in the ark itself, but in "the sides,"

forming but one roll, though divided into parts and sections; not into books till probably the time of the Septuagint, when the present Greek names were given. This is *the roll* of which we read in Deut. xxxi. 24, "that when Moses had made an end of writing the words of this law *in a book*, until they were finished, that Moses commanded the Levites, which bare the ark of the covenant of the Lord, saying, Take the book of the law, and put it in the side of the ark of the covenant of Jehovah your God, that it may be there for a witness against thee." Of this *book* we read first, on the occasion of the defeat of Amalek, as *a book* (βιβλίον or in lxx. βιβλίον), next in the twenty-fourth chapter of Exodus as *the book of the covenant*, and, when found again in the days of Josiah, it is called by the same name, "the book of the covenant" (2 Chron. xxxiv. 30); so it was the *blood-sprinkled book*. This is virtually "the handwriting of ordinances that was against us, that was contrary unto us," and which Christ took out of the way, nailing it to his cross. The ministration of death, written and engraven *in stones*, was, on the other hand, the tablets of stones, which alone were deposited in the ark. This roll is called the law of Moses by Ezra, the book of the law of God by Nehemiah. Again, it is called the book of the law of Moses in Ezra, Nehemiah, and 2 Chronicles, where it is also

styled "the book of the covenant," spoken of as one thing. In the days of Jehoshaphat it is spoken of as "the book of the law of Jehovah." When found again by Hilkiah, in the days of Josiah, he named it at once *THE BOOK* of the law, saying, "I have found the book of the law in the house of the Lord" (2 Kings xxii. and 2 Chron. xxxiv.). This one book of Moses, deposited by commandment in the sides of the ark, refound in the days of Josiah, became from that time an object of increased attention. It had evidently been almost forgotten. You see how different this from the state of things in our own day, when, instead of one roll, every one may have the privilege of reading "in their own tongues the wonderful works of God. It was not so then. It was found *again*, the sacred depository of truth and part of that testimony which was committed to the chosen witnesses of Jehovah. It had become antiquated in style, so that the Levites were obliged "to read distinctly, and to give the sense, and cause them to understand the reading." It must have contained the directions in Leviticus referring to the dwelling in booths in the seventh month, just as in the days of Josiah it must have embodied the curses threatened by Jehovah on the disobedience of his people, as in Deuteronomy xxviii.

"The book" was then the Pentateuch; and as in the time of Jehoshaphat there had been an

attempt, by the mission of Levites with THE BOOK in their hands, to rouse the national attention, so after the time of Ezra, when the synagogue worship arose, and the national interest was increasingly concentrated on the law and the prophets, in such proportion copies must have been multiplied, and collusion or fraud rendered impossible.

Then came the collection of these books and their revision under Ezra, and we have every reason to believe in the supposition (though we cannot say that actually the various additions and explanations were made by Ezra) that there were recorded in this roll different explanations, such as the names of the different places which had changed in that long interval before his days. The modern names were sometimes given;\* and, again, the *ephah*, for the

\* The name Dan, given to the northern part of the land in Gen. xiv., where the conquest of the kings by Abraham is recorded, perhaps, also, in Deut. xxxiv., where Moses sees the mountain region as closing in the view of the Land of Gilead, has been supposed to be an instance of this, and fierce attacks against this portion of the Word have been made, from Spinoza down to Colenso, on the supposed mistake of the writer by *prolepsis* from Judges xviii.

It appears probable that this is all an error, and that the name Dan was applied from the most ancient days (see Thomson's "Land and the Book," p. 139) to the region from whence one of the sources of the Jordan, called now Nahr ed Dahn, flows, (the spring being called Leddân). The Danite marauders, when they had sacked and then rebuilt Laish, named the city, perhaps, not without reference to the previous name of the district, Dan, after the name of their father. Such coincidences are not without parallel. Compare Gen. xxi., where the heaps (v. 47), *Galeed* contains an evident



old measure *omer*. These portions were probably introduced in this manner, and so were other details as to the different nations that were driven out of the country before the Israelites. The particulars of the death of Moses in the end of Deuteronomy were probably added by Ezra, or, perhaps, the last chapter of Deuteronomy formed part of the Book of Joshua. I dwell upon these points, not because I think them of much importance, for so long as these things were recorded according to the will of God, and in connection with the living witnesses (the nation to whom in this respect the Holy Ghost was given to guide them\*), I do not think it is of any material consequence by whom the canonical books

*paronomasia* as raised in Mount *Gilead* (v. 23). Compare, also, sub. voc. Beersheba in Smith's "Dictionary," where the reader will notice there is a similar difficulty.

There is an unused root,  $\text{דָּנָן}$ , *Danan* (Ges. Lex.), which would give a word of very good meaning applied to the Huleh, or *plain* where Dan was situated, and the tradition from St. Jerome's day downwards that Dan as one source entered into the composition of the very name Jordan (*Yarden* or *Urdun*), is not to be altogether overlooked.

If the Phœnician inscription (a copy of which I have seen) really mentions the conquest of Dan by the King of Sidon, this must refer to an era previous to the settlement of the Danites in the land, as the Sidonians themselves were conquered by the King of Ascalon about 1209 B.C., and never afterwards had any political importance (see Kenrick's "Phœnicia," p. 242).

\* Caiaphas, as the high priest of God's people, was inspired by the Holy Ghost, and although a bad man, gave forth a true prophecy.

were written. Take, for example, the Book of Ruth. This book is valuable in connection with the history of David and the chosen nation, and as showing forth redemption in an earthly sense. Who the author was I do not know, nor do I think it at all important. Whether these additions were made by Ezra or some one else, I look upon them equally as part of the canon of Scripture, and part of the Word of God.

You will trace in my remarks an allusion to the difficulties which have been found by some writers, Germans and others, in the Books of Moses; and the explanation I have given seems to me to be the simple one. I look upon the Old Testament as a whole, and, as connected with the New Testament as a beautiful and blessed work of God. I see it full of the most wonderful declarations of God's dealings with his people in the olden time, unfolding in these his glory and majesty, and I see in it the reflection and the history of man's heart under so many varied trials and experiences, that it shines forth with its own inherent glory as suited to every age and circumstance. In the experience of God's own children, there is no time of life, from childhood to old age, in which the narratives of the Old Testament do not come right home to our hearts, if we read them aright and with the enlightenment of the Holy Spirit. We must remember that we always

need the guidance and help of the Spirit to read the inspired books aright. We might read them merely for the gratification of our intellect, or for other purposes than those for which God has given them; but as the scaffolding which He has been pleased to use in erecting a temple to his praise, I never can sufficiently admire the wondrous wisdom in which God has presented Himself to us in the Word which I have been thus tracing in its unfoldings to Christians who themselves form that temple.

As time passes on, we have to notice the results of the Babylonish captivity and then of the persecution by Antiochus in the establishment of the synagogue worship among the Jews, something very similar to our chapel worship, very different to that which had been established before the time of the Babylonish captivity. After this the Scriptures had to be read every Sabbath-day. It was to the Scriptures, as thus gradually evolved by the Holy Spirit in connection with the history of God's chosen nation and witnesses, and thus embodied most carefully in the recognized canon of Scripture, which was used by the Jews in all the synagogues—it was to this, *the Old Testament as thus constituted*, that our blessed Lord gave the impress of his authority. And without going too far into details to show you the data from which we may derive more or less definite in-

formation about the Old Testament canon, we may rest assured on the ground of the goodness of God and his providential mercy and care towards his people, that we have in the authorized version, the Old Testament Scripture as it was held among the Jews in the time of our Saviour. It is recorded by Eusebius that about the year of our Lord 172, Onesimus, a Christian of Asia Minor, had frequently expressed a desire to learn the exact truth with regard to the old books, how many they were in number, and their order. Melito, the pious Bishop of Sardis, after a visit to the East, and even to the very spot where all was proclaimed and done, in which he obtained exact knowledge of the books of the Old Covenant, sent a list of them to his friend. The names of them are, he says, five books of Moses, Genesis, Exodus, Numbers, Leviticus, Deuteronomy, Jesus the son of Naue (*i.e.*, Joshua), Judges, Ruth, four books of Kings, two of Chronicles, a book of the Psalms of David, the Proverbs of Solomon, which is also called Wisdom, Ecclesiastes, the Song of Songs, Job, the books of the Prophets Isaiah, Jeremiah, the twelve (minor prophets) in a single book, Daniel, Ezekiel, Esdras (Ezra). This appears to be a catalogue of the books in the Palestinian Septuagint, the Greek Bible so often quoted by the apostles. Three books of our Old Testament are not mentioned in it—Lamentations, Nehemiah, and

Esther. The two former were commonly attached to Jeremiah and Ezra respectively. Possibly Esther was also included in the latter book.

I must seek to impress upon every mind the need of acting upon the promise of our gracious Lord in which He says that God will give his Holy Spirit to them that ask Him. If there is any mind still in doubt and perplexity, let such an one ask of God. An old Chinese, a man of intelligence, before whom Mr. Hudson Taylor laid the Scriptures in Chinese, said, "Well, you bring me these. How can I tell if this is a true translation of your sacred books which you say were written in Hebrew and Greek? I am an old man, and never can learn Hebrew and Greek." This was a very right and reasonable question to ask, and Mr. Taylor very properly said, "You acknowledge the being and existence of God, the Author of life; let us, then, kneel down together and ask Him to guide your mind aright as to whether or not this is the truth." They did so, and the issue was most happy to that Chinese. He is now, in connection with the Church Missionary Society, diligently seeking to serve the Lord as a Christian believer. A like happy result will in each case follow from taking the same course, and asking God for divine teaching, without which nothing can be truly certain or blessed.

I now come to the New Testament, and there

again I see the evolution of the Scripture in connection with the living witnesses, and with the possession of the Holy Spirit. These three again accompany each other in the inspiration and giving forth of the books which constitute our New Testament.

I scarcely need refer you to many passages which are familiar to every Christian believer, in which the New Testament is spoken of as a Divine inspiration. There is one I would turn to in the first instance, for I think it is not always understood ; that in Romans xvi. 25, 26 : “ Now to him that is of power to stablish you according to my gospel, and the preaching of Jesus Christ, according to the revelation of the mystery, which was kept secret since the world began, but now is made manifest, and by the Scriptures of the prophets, according to the commandment of the everlasting God, made known to all nations for the obedience of faith.” Rather translate “ and *by prophetic writings*, according to the commandment of the everlasting God.” Those prophetic writings were certainly those of the New Testament. The Church, as you are well aware, had its prophets as well as the Jewish nation in old times. When the favour of God passed over from the Jewish depository or witness to the Christian depository or witness—that is to say, the Church—then the gift of the Holy Ghost, the gift of prophecy, and all those

miraculous and wondrous gifts, passed over also ; and this is probably that which is referred to in the Hebrews (chap. vi.) : “ Therefore leaving the principles (or foundation) of the doctrine of Christ ”—that is, the Old Testament—“ let us go on to perfection. And this will we do, if God permit. For it is impossible for those who were once enlightened, and have tasted of the heavenly gift, and were made partakers of the Holy Ghost, and have fallen\* away, to renew them again into repentance.” Here the Apostle, I think, is speaking of the old Jewish witnesses—the Jewish nation, who had had all those favours, and had been so blessed of God. He could not hope anything from ploughing over the old Jewish ground. He could not hope anything for those who had crucified the Son of God afresh, and put Him to an open shame. I do not think he is speaking of individual experience, and therefore I regret that any one should take it as a reason why they should despair. He is speaking of the nation that is rejected, and of the Christian Church as the receiver of the blessing, and as bringing forth fruit worthy of Him by whom the Church is saved.

In the New Testament, then, seeing we have come to the great manifestation of God—that is to say, God manifest in the flesh—we have, as opening the book, most naturally the fourfold record of the

\* και παραπίπτοντας (See Alford, *in loco*).

life, death, and resurrection of our blessed Lord, a record given to us by the Holy Spirit, through human witnesses, according to the will of God ; and the testimony of two men is true, according to the Mosaic law. God would have the testimony of man as well as the testimony of his Spirit. To all these things, that are so important for us to receive on the authority of God, and on the testimony of our fellow men, God links all the body together, raising up prophets, and apostles, and teachers, that through their testimony, sanctioned and sealed by the Holy Ghost, we might have strong consolation. Turn to the account of the crucifixion in John for an illustration of this principle (xix. 33) : “ But when they came to Jesus, and saw that he was dead already, they brake not his legs ; but one of the soldiers, with a spear, pierced his side, and forthwith came thereout blood and water. And *he that saw it bare record*, and his record is true, and he knoweth that he saith true, that ye might believe. For these things were done that the Scripture should be fulfilled.” Here you see the Divine and human element conjoined. The Holy Ghost was promised to the disciples in order that they might bear witness of Christ (xv. 26) : “ When the Comforter is come, whom I will send to you from the Father, he shall testify of me, and ye also shall bear witness.” Here is the double witness, the witness of the Spirit and



the witness of the apostles : “ He shall testify and ye shall bear witness.” Here is the attestation of this most important fact, on which the believer rests his hopes, the death of our blessed Saviour for us, and the flowing forth from his side of the blood and water. We have the assured presence and testimony of the Holy Ghost ; and the apostles and those who conjoined with the apostles are included as witnesses to this great fact—all those who bore witness as men, and yet bore witness with the concurring power of the Holy Ghost ; and all the miraculous works which they did in his name ; and all the prophecies which they spake in the name of Jesus, bearing witness to those great truths on which our hopes rest. So there is in the New Testament Scriptures, as well as in the Old, a kind of incarnation of God, if I may so speak ; that is to say, He in a certain sense incarnates Himself in his word to our apprehensions. He does not in all cases act as divine and as out of our sight, as He does in creation, for instance ; but He comes to us in a way which we can understand, speaking to us by men of like passions with ourselves, bearing witness through the patriarchs and prophets of the Old Testament, and through the apostles and prophets of the New Testament ; thus bringing before us the truth He would have us believe in a way most suited to our apprehension, most likely to establish us in the faith ; for instance, as

regards this very point, this fourfold witness to the life, the death, the sufferings of our blessed Saviour.

God in his great grace has appointed his fourfold witness—four witnesses who come forward and bear their testimony quite independently one of another, as you see by the very difficulty there may be in some places to reconcile the statements in every particular. You find one looking at a thing from one side, and another from another side, and yet bearing witness to the same fact. 'It is a blessed corroboration of the fact that is presented to us by the Holy Ghost inspiring these four witnesses, that each witness preserves his own character and speciality; just as if I may take four different kinds of pens and write, the writing may be mine and yet it may bear the impress of the pens with which I write. It is quite clear that God delights to use man, so that whilst his communications to us are truly divine, they are marked with the special character of the human instrument through whom the revelation is given. Every one who reads the Scripture with attention is cognisant of this fact. It does not suggest to my mind the slightest difficulty, it is rather to me the great proof of the goodness of God that He will so use man, and that condescending to do so He comes to meet me in my poor feeble apprehension of that which He means to ~~teach~~ **teach me in a way which I can understand; whereas**

if He were to speak only in a divine way, I could not understand it. I might have no possible means of perceiving the truth that God would teach me, except He had taught it to me through my fellow men.

You see the same truth pervading the rest of the books of the New Testament, which are all “inspired writings,” or, as you read, the “more sure word of prophecy.”

New Testament history proceeds forth from the Gospels—the history of the One chosen Witness. Then comes the Acts of the Apostles sent forth by Him, and then the letters and treatises which we call the Epistles, and at last we come to the closing book, which, like that of the Old Covenant in its place, is the closing book *till the Lord shall come*. The Book of Malachi and the Apocalypse of John both take leave of the Church till the Lord shall come, sealing up in each case the canon of inspiration till then. No further Scripture was written after the Apocalypse. God had then given, in connection with his church, what was necessary for our guidance and salvation, and for the depositary of the truth till the end. And now, when we look at this authoritative revelation, we see how it is connected with the living witnesses, the written word, and the Holy Ghost.

It seems to some minds very fragmentary

Here is a letter to a master about a runaway slave, and his being sent back ; and here is a letter to a Christian lady—a letter of Christian experience and salutation ; and here are other things that do not seem to us worthy of a place in the Word of God.

Now it seems to me that this very fragmentary character is part of the completeness of the New Testament—part of the beautiful order of the Book of God. It is very strikingly in accordance with what meets the view in nature, as, for instance, in the development of an oak tree out of an acorn, each portion gradually unfolded, here a sprig and there a leaf, till at last the tree is grown up, we hardly know how. And yet you see the majestic strength and power of the oak tree growing up from little beginnings, so obscure and unnoticeable that one would hardly think they were going on at all. God has brought out something that may be compared to an oak in all its majesty and power. And how has He done it ? in the New Testament He has brought out this in the lives of the witnesses—sometimes in their domestic life, as in the case of Timothy for example, growing up into the unfeigned faith of his grandmother Lois, and of his mother Eunice. And this presents exactly what we stand in need of. In the Old Testament we find David counselling Solomon. He speaks of him as “ my son,” and the exhorta-

tion he gives him is taken up by God in the New Testament as an exhortation to all the sons of God. In Hebrews xii. 5, we read, "Ye have forgotten the exhortation which speaketh unto you as unto children. My son, despise not thou the chastening of the Lord, nor faint when thou art rebuked of him." That is quoted from Prov. iii. 11, 12. There is the father speaking to his son, and God takes it up and uses it for his own children, and a beautiful word of command it is to the believer. In the first place it was spoken by an earthly father to his son—doubtless not without the spirit and guidance of God, who intended to make use of it in the development of his truth. 3203

And now another thought in connection with the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament. When I take up this book which we have been looking at as the oracles of the Jewish and Christian churches, I find that it is a most remarkable one. I see unity in diversity just as I see in all the works of God. God is ever bringing out his great designs in such a way that they are one and yet manifold. You can trace this even in the very leaves of a tree. You see they are all one and at the same time they are manifold. There are no two leaves exactly alike. And so in a company of people; you see the human element in each face, and the features of the human race, and yet how

different they are one from another. So in the hearts of men, and so in all the works of God. There is infinite variety in all his creatures, and yet they are so blended together that you can with difficulty say where one kingdom begins and another ends. All these things are familiar to those who study the works of God. The difference between the vegetable and the animal kingdoms is so little marked, that you cannot tell to which some of the creatures of God belong, or whether they are not for one part of their lives in one kingdom and for another part of their lives in another. And so God in all his works shows infinite variety and inimitable skill and wisdom, and yet there is unity in all, so that any one who looks at creation must see it is all the work of one mind. It is impossible that there could have been two minds at work. Go to the other side of the world and you find a vast variety in the objects that meet your view. Everything is strangely diverse from what one meets with here ; but the same mind has evidently been the creator of all. Now I take up the Scriptures and I see there two revelations most marvellously forming one book, so that if I take up the first Book of the Old Testament and compare it with the last Book of the New, I find that the last Book of the New Testament in its concluding chapters is but the consummation and filling up of the sketch of what

God intended to do—which is brought out in the first chapters of Genesis. This is only one instance out of many. Take another instance. I find in the address to the Laodicean church a most evident reference to a book which has been very much misunderstood—the Song of Solomon. I ask how is this except the Scriptures are—though as I have been showing, in one sense quite human—in another sense, and the more important sense, quite divine; the work of one mind, God working through man instrumentally by the Holy Ghost? How else can I at all explain it? And when I do take this view of it it raises my mind in thankfulness to God, and I am ready to say with old Herbert :—

“ Oh that I knew how all the lights combine,  
And the configurations of their glory,  
Seeing not only how each verse doth shine,  
But all the constellations of the story !”

As when I look above I like to see all the constellations, not only individual stars, so in God's Word I see his thoughts combined in many constellations, and yet the whole heaven of the story is all the work of ONE MIND.

I will conclude with some thoughts of Charnock, one of the old divines, who is very rich in his appreciation of the goodness of God. He says :—

“ The Scripture is a garden which the hand of divine bounty hath planted for us. In it He con-

descends to shadow Himself in those expressions that render Him in some manner intelligible to us. Had God wrote in a loftiness of style suitable to the greatness of his majesty, his writings had been as little understood by us, as the brightness of his glory can be beheld by us. But he draws phrases from our affairs to express his mind to us. He incarnates Himself in his word to our minds before his Son was incarnate in the flesh to the eyes of men. He ascribes to Himself eyes, ears, 'hands, that we might have from the consideration of ourselves and the whole human nature a conception of his perfection. He assumes to Himself the members of our bodies to direct our understanding in the knowledge of his Deity. This is *his goodness*."

And again.

"How admirable is Divine Goodness! He hath sent his Son to die for us, and his written Word to instruct us, and his Spirit to edge it for an entrance into our souls. He hath opened the womb of the earth to nourish us, and sent down the records of heaven to direct us in our pilgrimage. He hath provided the earth for our habitation while we are travellers, and sent his Word to acquaint us with a felicity at the end of our journey, and the way to attain in another world what was wanting to us in this—namely, a happy immortality."



## LECTURE II.

### ON THE BOOKS OF THE OLD TESTAMENT, AND THEIR AUTHORSHIP.

IN this lecture I propose to look at the human side of the question in reference to the means by which these precious oracles of God were delivered to us, by what authors, and in what special way. In the most important sense the authorship of the Bible is the same as the authorship of nature ; as expressed in the celebrated saying of one of the greatest minds,\* “ The Bible has God for its author, salvation for its end, and truth, without any mixture of error, for its contents.” But still it is necessary to look very carefully into the question, in order to meet the great variety of assaults that are made upon our faith in the present day.

No one can read the New Testament carefully without seeing that its reception was very much intended to rest upon the consentaneous agreement of the multitude of believers. There are many expressions

\* Locke.

such as "We know that we all have knowledge" (1 Cor. viii. 1), and again, "This is the disciple which testifieth of these things, and wrote these things, and *we know* that his testimony is true" (John xxi), from which we see how much rested on this united judgment. What is called the canon of the Scriptures especially was intended to rest in the Old Testament times on the consentaneous agreement of the nation to which they were entrusted; and in the New Testament times, on the reception of the books by the "holy nation"\* of believers in Christ, the "Catholic," or universal church. The general body of Christians having declined into that tremendous apostacy called the Church of Rome, and the effort of Protestantism being, through God's grace, to recover in some measure from that great catastrophe which had happened to the Christian commonwealth; the Church, whilst enlightened as to salvation by the Holy Spirit, was from Luther downwards thrown very much on its own resources; and as regards the question of what books belonged to the canon of the Scriptures, and what did not, we find Luther using very unguarded language, and taking his reason for his guide. Now this—if you will refer to what was said in the last lecture—appears to me entirely contrary to the purpose of God as regards his

\* 1 Pet. ii.

oracles, both under the Old Covenant and under the New Covenant. I have sought to show you in the last lecture that there never was any division betwixt the witnesses for God—those who were his appointed servants—and the oracles that were put into their hands to be used and understood by means of God's gift of the Holy Ghost. And therefore any criticism which dispenses altogether with the prayerful seeking of the guidance and help of the Holy Spirit, I must hold to be essentially infidel, unbelieving, outside the pale of the Christian church; and if found in a soldier of the cross, such as Luther, to whom we have so much reason to be indebted, still it is the same—essentially infidel and unbelieving in its character, since it is the place of the disciple to bow to the authority of his teacher, and of the servant to submit to the autocracy of his Lord.

Any criticism, then, which proceeds upon the assumption of inherent wisdom in man, and his fitness to pronounce on the works and ways of God, or, as more especially we are considering, his Word, loses sight of the relationship between the creature and the Creator, between God the Judge of all and the guilty creature who has to settle his own account before he can either impartially or with an enlightened mind contemplate the revelation given to him. One of the earliest Christian writers after

the days of the apostles, not later than about the year 120 or 130 of the Christian era — Justin Martyr, as he is commonly called; that is, Justin the Witness—who wrote on behalf of Christianity, and then died for it—describes his conversion through the means of an old Christian. Having turned his attention from philosophy to Christianity, this old Christian said to him, “Pray, before all things, that the gates of light be opened to you, for the truths for which you seek are not comprehensible by the eye or mind of man, unless God and his Christ give him understanding.” It remains true from that time to this, and it never can be shaken, that in order to judge aright concerning this matter, we need the enlightening influence of the Spirit of God.

The great difficulty which long hindered the right apprehension of the solar system was the fact that man could only contemplate the system from a *geocentric* stand-point. Could he have assumed a *heliocentric* position, all would have been clear. It is much the same in reference to the kingdoms both of nature and of grace. Could we take our stand with God as the centre, and see all things as *He* beholds them, the obscurity which now attends our minds would be all cleared away. The great fact, that man is in a wrong position as towards the God whose word he seeks to criticize, makes it impos-

sible that he should be impartial in his judgment; but even supposing a man's mind is set right—supposing him to be really at peace and at *one* with God, through the Atonement—still he has such a vast subject before him, whether in creation or whether in the Scriptures, that it is more than a finite mind can grasp—more than any one mind can master. The earliest great critic on the New Testament Scriptures—Origen—remarks upon this difficulty. He says, “He who has once received the Scriptures as derived from the Creator of the World must expect to find in them also all the difficulties which meet those who investigate the systems of creation.” •

This is an observation which must present itself not only to Origen, but to every thoughtful mind. And in reference to the books of the Old Testament, there is a great analogy betwixt that which we perceive in the vastness of creation and of that scheme which is unfolded to us in God's Word. In creation we lift up our eyes to the starry heavens, and we say, How little is the earth we tread upon in comparison with all the universe! What can be the special advantage of all those innumerable orbs of light that meet our eyes? And nature gives us no answer. We look around upon this globe and see how large a space is not only uninhabited, but unfit for the abodes of man; how small a part really is

inhabited by the race for which it seems especially intended. Yet a greater acquaintanceship with the works of God in nature leads us to anticipate that where we find a desolate tract of country we may look in the soil for hidden riches that only require skill and wisdom to bring them out. In proportion as we study the works of God we see his wisdom unfolding itself in supplying those things which are necessary to our well-being. Moreover, we find that man is the highest and noblest work, and that all things are subservient to him. And if we take the Book of Revelation, we behold in like manner that all things culminate in this glorious person, Emmanuel, *God with us*, and in God's purposes concerning *Him*. So that vastness is not any criterion at all of the importance of any part of the creation of God. Our little earth *may* be of greatly more importance in God's sight than myriads of bright stars far away in the heavens, and *must* be so, if passing over the nature of angels, and all other created intelligences, "He took on him the seed of Abraham"—God, the Creator of all, thus linking this earth, and all that is in it, to Himself in an ineffable embrace. And so as regards the books of the Old Testament Scriptures, there are books concerning which no one by means of their own powers of reason could accurately determine whether they were to form part of the canon of God's Word or not.

Take, for instance, the Book of Esther, which has been much discussed, and about which many difficulties have arisen. I suppose that no one who heard my last lecture would hesitate to agree with me that it may have, and indeed that it has, a very important place as showing God's hand working unseen for his chosen people when He could not openly stamp them as his people—giving us therefore, lessons which we could not learn in reference to their more ostensible position as witnesses for Him. Generally speaking, a great painter leaves less finished a good deal in his paintings in order to direct more special attention to that part on which he wishes the eye to rest.' Now there is something similar in the Scriptures. There is a good deal that is left not altogether unfinished, but *sufficiently* finished *for its place* in the whole structure. It all coheres together as one, and the more we study it the more we see God's wisdom in directing our attention specially to that which He designs us to learn, namely, the glory of Jesus as shining through all dispensations for—"the testimony of Jesus is the spirit of prophecy."

We have to rest on the agreement of the Old Testament congregation, that is to say, the Jews, for the canonical authority of the books which were delivered to their guardian care. It seems to me that, in this respect, the testimony of tradition is

not at all to be undervalued. We do not despise this testimony as regards the things with which we are conversant in the world of our fellow-men. Let us then consider the testimony of the people themselves, the Jews, as to what they consider the authorship of the books of their own Scriptures, that is, the Old Testament; and first, as to the embodying of these writings into a book which has reached our times. When we look back at the vast antiquity of the Old Testament Scriptures, we cannot expect to get any connected history at all concomitant, or of the same date or era, although from Egyptian and Assyrian sources especially, much that is confirmatory of their testimony has been gathered. We must collect the witness to their authenticity from a later period. We inquire of the Jewish people, and they, in a book written by the Babylonian Jews, and called the "Gemara," thus embody the tradition of the nation:—

"Who wrote the books of the Bible? Moses wrote his own book, the section about Balaam and Job. Joshua wrote his own book, and the last eight verses of the Pentateuch. Samuel wrote his own book—the books of Judges and Ruth. David wrote the book of Psalms (of which some were composed by the ten venerable elders—Adam, the first man, Melchizedek, Abraham, Moses, Haman, Jeduthun, Asaph, and the three sons of Koran.



Jeremiah wrote his own book—the books of Kings and Lamentations. Hezekiah and his friends [wrote the books included in] the memorial word Jamshak,\* *i.e.*, Isaiah, Proverbs (Meshalim), Canticles (Shir hashirim), and Ecclesiastes (Koheleth). The men of the Great Synagogue [the books included in] the memorial word Kandag, *i.e.*, Ezekiel, the twelve (minor prophets), Daniel, and Esther. Ezra wrote his own book, and continued the genealogies of the books of Chronicles down to his own times . . . . But who completed them (the books of Chronicles)? Nehemiah, the son of Hachaliah.”

I think this is in all probability very nearly a correct tradition of the embodying of the Old Testament Scriptures, in the form in which we now have them, and also of their authorship. I should take as authentic such a testimony, from those who were the chosen witnesses, to keep this precious deposit committed to them.

Now look at the testimony of another Jew, Josephus. His treatise on the antiquity of the Jews was compiled sometime about A.D. 93, thus very early in our era, and was intended to maintain the belief in the early origin and records of the Jewish nation, against the objections drawn from the silence of the Greeks. With this object Josephus points out the late introduction of writing to

\* Containing in Hebrew the initial letters of the books.

the western nations, and the absence of early authentic registers of public events among them. "In skill of composition the East," he says, "yields to Greece, but not in the accurate history of antiquity, and still less in the special history of different nations." In illustration of this statement, he quotes first the primitive annals of the Egyptians, Babylonians, and Phœnicians; and then goes on at once to speak of the Jewish records in 'greater detail, as the fact of their antiquity was not equally familiar to his readers. The whole passage, though long, is of the highest interest: "Dismissing all inquiry into the records of Egypt, Babylon, and Greece, as it is universally admitted that they date from the earliest time, I shall endeavour," he says, "to show briefly that our forefathers exhibited the same care as the nations already mentioned in the record of events, for I do not stop to maintain that it was even *greater*, as they enjoined this duty on their high priests and prophets, and [further I shall show] how this custom has been preserved up to our time with great exactness, and, to venture on a bold assertion, how it will still be preserved. For not only did we commit this charge in the first instance to the best men, and those who were devoted to the service of God, but we also took care to preserve the priestly race, constantly pure and unmixed . . . (even) in Egypt and Babylon,

and in any other place in the whole world, where any of the priestly race are scattered. . . . Our accuracy in this respect is most conclusively proved by the fact, that the descent of our priests is preserved in our records by name from father to son two thousand years back. . . . Naturally, therefore, or rather necessarily [this accuracy is found in our archives], inasmuch as the making the record did not rest upon the simple will of any, and there is no discrepancy in the facts recorded." That is an important statement; he says, "*that making the record did not rest on the simple will of any man,*" and this when compared agrees well with the apostle Peter's declaration that "No Scripture is of private interpretation, but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost."

"But the prophets only [composed our annals] who narrate the most remote and ancient events through the inspiration of God, and compiled exactly the history of the occurrences of their own time. For we have not tens of thousands of books, discordant and conflicting, but only twenty-two, containing the record of all time, which have been justly believed to be divine. And of these, *five* are the books of Moses, which embrace the laws and the tradition of the creation of man, reaching up to his (Moses') death. This period is little short of three thousand years. Next, the prophets, who

succeeded, compiled the history of the period from Moses to the reign of Artaxerxes, the successor of Xerxes, king of Persia, in *thirteen* books, [relating severally] what was done in their times. The remaining four books embrace hymns to God, and practical directions for men. From the time of Artaxerxes to our own time each event has been recorded; but the records have not been deemed worthy of the same credit as those of earlier date, because the exact succession of the prophets was not continued." He is speaking of the Apocrypha: the records of the Judges, Judas Maccabeus, etc.

"But what faith we have placed in our own writings is seen by our conduct; for though so long a time has now passed, no one has dared either to add anything to them, or to take anything from them, or to alter anything. But all Jews are instinctively led from the moment of their birth to regard them as decrees of God, and to abide by them, and if need be gladly to die for them. So ere now many of our captive countrymen have been often seen to endure tortures, and all kinds of deaths in theatres, that they might utter no word against the laws and the records which are united with these. And what Greek would endure such a test in like case? Nay, rather, no Greek will endure even an ordinary loss to save the whole literature of his nation from destruction."

Upon this, Mr. Westcott\* observes:—

“When every allowance is made for the rhetorical character of the passage, and the evident desire of Josephus to adapt his statements to the feelings of heathen writers, several important conclusions may be certainly deduced from it.

“(1.) The sacred writings were distinctly limited in number, and this number (it appears) was admitted by universal consent.

“(2.) The reign of Artaxerxes (c. 450 B.C.) was regarded as the extreme limit of the Divine history (*i.e.*, according to Josephus, the Book of Esther).

“(3.) The books were esteemed divine, and this without any distinction between the three classes into which they were divided (Law, Prophets, Psalms, or, to use the technical terms, Hagiographa, *i.e.*, Holy Writings).”

I now turn your attention to the testimony of Philo, which is very important in connection with the subject of the Apocrypha. Philo was an Alexandrian Jew, a man of great genius. He flourished rather before the time of Josephus, about A.D. 38, and the testimony which he gives with regard to the Pentateuch, in spite of the disturbing influences by which he was surrounded, appears to have been

\* “The Bible in the Church,” by B. F. Westcott, M.A., p. 28. A very able work, which has come under my notice since I gave the last lecture, and which is quoted freely in this present portion.

much the same as that of Josephus as to the number of the sacred books. "The Pentateuch, indeed, as was natural, occupied the first place in his regard. The later books, according to his principles of interpretation, were but partial elucidations of its teaching, and their writers 'companions of Moses,' or 'members of his sacred band.' Of the Law he says, that after a lapse of more than two thousand years [the Jews] had not changed a single word of what had been written [by Moses], but would sooner endure to die a thousand times than consent to violate his laws and customs."\*

This is very important testimony indeed to the verbal accuracy of the Pentateuch, because it comes from what we must call an independent witness. The Alexandrine Jews differed exceedingly from their brethren in Judea and those in Babylon about many things, and their religion was very greatly corrupted by heathenism. Indeed it is very difficult to know whether such a man as Philo was more a Platonist, or a Grecian philosopher, or a Jew; he was a sort of Cosmopolite, standing in a different position to the Jews, and therefore his testimony cannot be taken so distinctly as that of a pure Jew; but still we cannot but see how valuable it is when considered in relation to the accuracy of the Pentateuch.

In connection with this you must observe,

\* Westcott's "The Bible in the Church," p. 32.

as Mr. Westcott points out, his peculiar views. Those peculiar views, in the first place, lowered the idea of a prophet—every man in Philo's opinion being a prophet. The Neo-platonists lowered the idea of inspiration, making it general to all mankind. The clear distinction between inspired and other writings was therefore lost, and when the Scriptures were translated into Greek—forming the Septuagint—a translation which grew up during a period of perhaps a hundred years—they introduced into the Septuagint many books which, as Josephus says, the strictest Jews would not admit; books which we call apocryphal, some of which, as 1 Maccabees, may be taken as true history, and in some of which there are good thoughts, worthy of good men, but in others there are passages very weak and questionable indeed. All these they included in what they called the Septuagint, and they mixed them with the sacred writings. So that the Septuagint, although the inspired portion of it is often quoted by the writers of the New Testament, included, in connection with this Alexandrine school of semi-heathenism, books of no authority, as is indeed admitted by the author of 2 Maccabees, where he says (c. xv.) “And if I have done well, and is fitting the story, it is that which I desired; but if slenderly and meanly, *it is that which I could attain unto.*”

The difficulty about the Apocrypha dates from that period, and has pervaded the Christian church ever since, but the testimony of Josephus is that the strict Jews totally excluded all these writings; and, moreover, we have reason to believe that the Apocrypha was not read at all in the early Christian churches. We know that the Scriptures were read there, since we have the testimony of Justin Martyr and of many others to that fact. 'In describing the Christian service in his day, which you will remember was a very early day, almost immediately after the apostle John's death, he states that the memoirs of the apostles, or writings of the prophets, are read as long as the time permitted. By "memoirs of the apostles," no doubt, he means the gospels, choosing the word "memoirs" in deference to the Greek philosophers, for whom he writes. We need not doubt that under this general description, "the memoirs of the apostles and writings of the prophets," he includes the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament. By "the writings of the prophets," he probably means the Old Testament. The immediately succeeding writers quote the Scriptures of the Old Testament with the words, "It is written." Ignatius, the early martyr, quotes the Scriptures with that appropriate word, "It is written"—referring apparently to what our Lord said when meeting the temptation



of the enemy. Looking back to these early Christian writers, it is very pleasing to see how they were provided, in the providence of God, with the Scriptures as thus translated into Greek, and read in the churches in all parts of the world. Greek was spoken then very much as French or English is spoken now, and the Old Testament Bible (the oracles of God in the Septuagint translation) was thus provided for the use of Christian assemblies everywhere. In connection with this it is very interesting to look back to the formation of the canon of the Old Testament. We see it at first acted out and embodied in the lives of those who have been the subjects of the history and the witnesses for God, and then gathered up, as we have seen, into records. In the first age there was the law written by Moses. Then when the social polity of the witnesses was beginning to be destroyed by their being permitted to be carried away by the heathen into captivity—when, I say, these witnesses were breaking down, and they themselves going into captivity, then began, more and more unfolding itself, the voice of God, through the prophets, to sustain the witness. And then immediately after the captivity, that which had been uttered by the prophets was more and more incorporated in the text of the Scriptures. Then came an epoch of persecution on the part of

Antiochus, in which he sought to destroy all the copies of the Scriptures ; but that still more endeared them to the people, as was very natural ; and from that time—as we read in the New Testament—Moses hath in every synagogue those who read him every Sabbath-day. See how remarkably the providence of God ordered the matter, that when the Jewish polity and nation had broken down as regards its consentaneous testimony for Jehovah, and was scattered abroad all over the world, the Jews carried with them the Bible, the Old Testament Scriptures, and became in every place where they were scattered the centres of light ; thus preparing the way for the gospel. The apostles went where the synagogues were, where they could read in their own tongues the wonderful works of God. The foundations of the Christian religion were, in the providence of God, thus already prepared. We shall notice this, in connection with the New Testament, in the next lecture. In the meantime I will read the summing-up of the testimony as to the history of the canon of the Old Testament, given in the book from which I have quoted :—

“The familiar division of the Old Testament into the law, the prophets, and the holy writings (*hagiographa*) probably indicates the three great forms in which the Bible was successively received

by the Jews. The law alone seems to have formed the Jewish Bible up to the captivity. At the return, a collection of the prophets was probably made by Ezra, and added to the sacred law. Afterwards the collection of the Hagiographa was formed; and the present Hebrew canon completed during the period of the Persian supremacy.

“Popular tradition points to Ezra and the Great Assembly, the council by which he was assisted, as having revised and closed this collection; and the belief is supported by strong internal probability. The discipline of the exile coming after the disasters of the kingdom had taught the Jews to welcome the wider views of God’s purposes which were revealed by the prophets; and for them the new groups of sacred writings must at once have assumed its true position beside the law.

“One remarkable historical statement confirms the view which has been given of the gradual formation of the later parts of the Jewish canon during the Persian period. Nehemiah, it is said [2 Maccabees ii. 13], while founding a library, gathered together the [writings] concerning the kings and prophets, and the [writings] of David and letters of kings about offerings. In other words, if we may trust to tradition, which has every mark of truth, Nehemiah completed the collection

of the prophets by the addition of the later historical books, and added to them a collection of Hagiographa." "Thus the whole Palestinian, and therefore in the truest sense the whole Jewish Bible, was completed, and separated from all other books; and in the prologue to Ecclesiasticus [c. B.C. 131), the complex title, the law, the prophets, and the remainder of the books, mark the Old Testament as distinctly as the corresponding Jewish phrase."

The argument for the truth of the whole Scripture, arising from the consentaneous agreement of so many writers, is well expressed by Dryden in his *Religio laici* :—

" Whence but from Heaven could men, unskilled in arts,  
In different ages born, in different parts,  
Weave such agreeing truths? or how, or why,  
Should all conspire to cheat us with a lie?  
Unasked their pains, unsought for their advice,  
Starving their gains, and martyrdom their price."

## LECTURE III.

### THE NEW TESTAMENT, ITS AUTHORITY AND AUTHORSHIP.

THE foundation of the authority of the New Testament is laid in the promise of the Comforter given by our blessed Saviour to guide the disciples into all truth, and to testify of Him,\* to accompany the witnesses for Christ according to the ancient promise in Isaiah, that the Spirit should “never depart out of the mouth of thy seed, and of thy seed’s seed, from henceforth and for ever.” That Holy Spirit was commissioned to dwell with and inspire the chosen witnesses. We read in John xiv. 16, “I will pray the Father, and he shall give you *another* Comforter, that he may abide with you for ever; even the Spirit of truth.” Then, in John xv. 26, we read, “But when the Comforter is come, whom I will send unto you from the Father, even the Spirit of truth, which proceedeth from the Father, he shall testify of me; and ye also shall

\* John xiv., xv., xvi.

bear witness, because ye have been with me from the beginning." Again, in chapter xvi. and 13th verse—"Howbeit when he, the Spirit of truth, is come, he will guide you into all truth: for he shall not speak of himself; but whatsoever he shall hear, that shall he speak; and he will show you things to come. He shall glorify me, for he shall take of mine and shall show it unto you." According to this gracious promise was the fulfilment on the day of Pentecost in the Holy Ghost coming down upon the assembled believers; and in connection with this gift of the Holy Ghost, we read that the edification of the church proceeded in the manner I have described through the chosen witnesses, their testimony being accompanied by the power of the Holy Ghost, as we read in Acts ii. 42—"They continued steadfastly in the Apostle's doctrine [or *teaching*] and fellowship, and in breaking of bread, and in prayers."

Now this oral teaching of the Apostles is that which in the first place we have to look to as occupying the first era in the Church's history; as the Apostle Paul says, "Christ sent me not to baptize, but to preach the gospel," putting the preaching of the gospel in the first and most important place.\* And this teaching of the Apostles occupies not only the first space of the church's history, but in

\* 1 Cor. i. 17.

the immediately succeeding age the reference always was to that which had been *taught* by the apostles from the beginning; and it was because the Scriptures were given forth by the apostles, the chosen servants and ambassadors of Christ, that they were received by the churches, and that in connection with the Spirit that dwelt alike in all, both the teachers and the taught, enabling them to exercise a spiritual judgment such as is formed whenever any man is in Christ, and is therefore a new creature, able through grace to add to his faith knowledge. The Scriptures as they were given forth, whether epistles or gospels, were received not as from any supreme authority of councils, but as given forth by the Spirit through the chosen witness-bearers. They were received by those who had the same Spirit, and were thus generally accepted. It was not at all the agreement of a certain number of men, or any possible combination of men, to produce a book, and to palm that book upon the world.

The way in which the New Testament grew up for the spiritual guidance of the Church was as different as possible from the attempt of the impostor Mohammed, who retired to a cave, and by the aid of some renegade Jew, produced the book called the Koran, the foundation of a professed revelation which owes all the power it has to what

it has stolen from the Old Testament Scriptures; being in every other sense an utterly worthless production, unworthy any man's attention; the only power it has being the assertion, "There is but one God," opposed to a multitude of idols, and that truth it steals from the Old Testament; in opposition to any such imposture as Mohammedanism, and any such as we have seen in our own day, Mormonism for example, the contents of a book professedly dug out of the earth, and which in the same way is utterly unworthy of any reasonable man's attention; in opposition to all this, the going forth of the Scriptures of the New Testament was entirely suited to the growing wants of the Church, meeting its every need. This is just in accordance with what we see in nature in the development of a plant. First one part is unfolded and then another, first the flower and then the fruit. So do we find it here. There is everything in season—everything in connection with the life and completing the fulness of the life which was embodied in the church, whilst all things have reference to that great manifestation of God in the person of his beloved Son, which is after all the grand focus of light to enlighten the world. As long as He was in the world He was the light of the world, and in his second coming, as described in the nineteenth chapter of Revelation He is called still THE WORD



OF GOD. All the New Testament Scripture as well as the Old, point to Him, and precious are its instructions to our souls, in that it is full of Christ.

The first part of the New Testament Scriptures that was given forth, as far as we can judge, was the epistles, and that before the gospels. The epistles of the Apostle Paul first; foremost the epistle to the Galatians. These epistles were letters embodying the counsels and instructions of the apostle to the churches from which he was absent for a season, and they were received not only by the church to which they were addressed, but by all the churches; they became the common property of all, as we find from the subsequent testimony of the whole church. These authoritative epistles or letters were then the first Scriptures of the New Testament in point of time, as Paul says in 1 Cor. xiv. 37, "The things that I write unto you are the commandments of the Lord." Their authoritative claim was admitted by the church, and they were so received, as we know from contemporary history.

Then, in the next place follows the embodying of the teaching of the apostles in written gospels to meet the need of the church. This was the origin of the four gospels. The gospel of Matthew is said to have been written by this apostle when he

was leaving Palestine to go to another sphere of labour. I shall go more fully into the gospels of Mark and Luke presently, and also of John, which was the last written, and that under peculiar circumstances, and with a particular intention. But before I dwell very much upon the gospels, I wish to add a remark as regards the feeling which prevailed very strongly in the early churches in favour of the oral teaching of the apostles. The Christians attached the greatest possible importance to what had been delivered by the apostles themselves, so much so that one of the witnesses I shall have to refer to seems to speak comparatively slightly of the written records when he compares them with what he had heard directly from the apostles themselves; passages these which have occasioned some difficulty, but which I shall explain in this way: that the events with which we become familiar, through eye-witnesses or persons that have lived contemporaneously, affect our minds in a very different way to those events of which we learn only through written history. Any one can understand this by thinking of their own experience. When I look back, for instance, at the events of the wars of Napoleon, though before my day, yet they are made quite familiar to me by those who were contemporaneous with them; and this is partially the case as regards even the invasion of the Pretender

in 1745, a hundred and twenty years ago. These events related in little anecdotes, speeches, and so forth, certainly give a very vivid impression to the mind of things which were to the narrators as the remembrance of yesterday—an impression which written history could not produce. And it is important to remember how strong the testimony that was borne to the authenticity of the facts of the gospel by the belief of thousands of those who were contemporaneous with the events recorded.

Before going further into details, I may also remark that the early church was under so strong an impression of the immediate return of the Lord, that the last thing in their thoughts was the production of Scripture for all future ages. The gospel was an announcement of facts, and of hopes founded on facts, which then conquered the world; and all the marvellous cohesion and unity of the New Testament we owe to the inspiring Spirit. It was never intended to be a book; it was called in the first instance *τα βιβλια*, that is to say, “the books.” This became in Latin *Biblia sacra*, that is, the Holy Bible; a change, you will observe, from the plural to the singular, as we now have it. It was called also in early days the Christian library; but it never was intended by the authors to have any unity at all. It was given forth to suit the need of the church.

To proceed further as regards the gospels : Mark is said to have written down the substance of Peter's public preaching. Luke committed to a book the gospel which Paul used to proclaim. Matthew, as I have said, wrote his gospel, as is supposed, and I have no doubt, according to the early tradition, in Syriac,\* of which our Greek Gospel according to St. Matthew is a translation. The gospel of John was written much later, and with a special purpose.

I now hasten forward to give you some of the early testimonies as to the way in which the books of the New Testament were received, and their canonical authority.

The first era to which I shall point your attention extends from about 80 A.D. to 120 A.D. We have remaining the works of three very remarkable witnesses to Christ, whose writings occupy just the same sort of relationship to the New Testament Scriptures that the Apocrypha does to the Old ; that is, a position of no authority in point of doctrine—for I shall show they do not claim it—and yet one of great interest, as highly confirmatory of the external evidences of the faith. The first of these is Clement of Rome, who wrote an epistle to the Corinthians about A.D. 95. The second, Ignatius of Antioch, who wrote several epistles about 107

\* The Peshito.

or some critics say 116 A.D. This is simply a variation as to the date; there is no question at all as to the general authority of his writings. In the third place, Polycarp, who was the pastor of the church at Smyrna, and who wrote from about 107 to 110, and suffered martyrdom in 167 A.D. Ignatius was martyred about the year 107. Clement also, I think, suffered martyrdom. These represent not only three very different regions of the earth, but what is also of great importance, three diverging streams of Christian thought. For though we are accustomed to think of the early church as one—and it was one in a very important sense; one in the communion of the Lord's table, one in faith in Christ as the only hope of the sinner—yet there were very different streams of thought, as any person who reads the Acts of the Apostles with attention cannot fail to observe; not only different, but sometimes conflicting, currents of thought and opinion on points just as important as those which divide Christians at the present day; and which, instead of being absolutely settled by authority so as never to appear again, carried down their courses to the subsequent ages.

Clement represents the current of Roman thought, the exact peculiarity of which I cannot stop to explain at the present moment. Ignatius of Antioch is an exceedingly interesting character,

of thoroughly Asiatic mind, glowing with love to the Saviour, a true-hearted, noble, conscientious Christian martyr—one whom it would have been delightful to know; at the same time with some infirmities about the character of his writings. The style of these writers is quite different from that of the New Testament. Any one, after reading the New Testament, and then turning to the epistles of Ignatius, or Clement, or Polycarp, must feel that he has descended to a much lower stage. He has got down, in fact, to the level of the writings of good men of the present day. They are not at all more instructive than these. You see traces of egotism, and also some beautiful passages—some full of fervour and of love. They might be read to edification, but at the same time they add nothing whatever to the completeness of the New Testament. But they bear testimony to the reception of the books of the New Testament; and, as regards their own writings, Clement apologizes for the tone of authority he uses, and refers the Corinthians to the epistles of the blessed Paul, who wrote to them “*spiritually*.” It is important to notice that he makes a distinction between the inspiration of the Bible and his own writings. Polycarp, who had listened to St. John, freely confesses that “neither he, nor any like him, is able to attain fully to the wisdom of the blessed

and glorious Paul." Ignatius disclaims the idea that he wished to impose his commands like Peter and Paul. These writers, including with them Barnabas, whose writings are placed side by side with them, refer to by far the greater number of the didactic books of the New Testament; and their testimony is valuable, as representing not only their views, but the public opinion of Christians of that era, and in distinct regions and lines of thought.

Ignatius and Polycarp represent, as I have said, two very different tones of Christianity to that of Clement of Rome. Of the New Testament, by far the greater number of the didactic books were certainly used by them. There are clear traces in their writings of the epistles of St. Paul to the Romans, 1 Corinthians, 2 Corinthians, Ephesians, 1 and 2 Timothy, Hebrews, James, 1 Peter, 1 John. The only certain reference to the gospels is one to St. Matthew from Barnabas. The gospels come in, in point of time, rather later than the epistles, and were more gradually received by the churches. From this time—that is, about the end of the first century of our era—follows a different age of the Church. In the celebrated letter of Pliny to the Emperor Trajan, which was dated 106 A.D., there is the opening out of a new state of things as regards the Christian Church.

Until that time, or nearly so, it had been growing up silently, quietly expanding in every direction, meeting with a great deal of persecution by the outbreak of the populace in certain places, but attracting no sort of imperial attention at all. It was viewed with very much the same sort of scorn as that with which the proud men of the present day—the great and wise—view anything like spiritual Christianity; just as Gallio viewed the Christians and Jews, and cared for none of these things. So it went on, till at last the multitude of Christians became so great, and their testimony so powerful, that the shrines of the gods began to be neglected, and idolatry was evidently beginning to totter to its fall. Then the attention of the authorities was aroused, and Pliny, who was a governor of that day, wrote to the Emperor Trajan a very celebrated letter, in which he asks what he is to do. He describes the Christians—how they meet and sing the praises of Christ as God. He says that they were an obstinate sort of people, and that if they were persecuted and killed, others came forward. That marks an era of persecution, when it was necessary for those who held the Christian faith to stand steadfast, and not only to suffer, but to plead for their cause. Therefore it has been called the era of the Apologists—that is of those who wrote on behalf of their religion.



One of the most remarkable of the Apologists is Justin Martyr. He was born at Sychem, at the foot of Mount Gerizim, but was a Greek by descent, and he tried all the different ranges of knowledge that he could meet with among the philosophers. At last he was converted, as he describes in the record of his life, by an old man who met him on the sea-shore, and pointed his attention, as I was remarking in a previous lecture, to the prophets, as those who expounded the Word of God. His testimony is exceedingly interesting, there is so much individuality about it. His writings include his "Apologies," and also a dialogue with Trypho the Jew. His testimony to the Scriptures is important; and what is perhaps still more so, is his reference to the oral teachings of the apostles, and to the general traditions which were in the whole Church as regards the life and acts of our blessed Saviour, which is so full, that it has been well said it would be possible to reconstruct the whole of the gospels out of the writings of Justin Martyr. This will give you an idea of the amount of reference, though it is not always in the shape of quotations. He is very lax in his quotations from the Old, and sometimes, also, when he quotes the New Testament. He speaks of the gospels as memoirs composed by the apostles and those who followed them; that is, as explained by a later

Christian writer—"Matthew and John, among the apostles, plant faith in us; and among their followers, Mark and Luke confirm us in our faith." Then he refers to a passage that is found only in Luke, as regards the agony of our blessed Lord, which he quotes fully, about the sweat being, as it were, great drops of blood falling down to the ground; marking the distinction between the apostles and their followers by quoting from Luke, who was not personally an apostle. In another place he refers to "the memoirs of Peter" for a fact that is contained only in the Gospel of Mark. That is interesting, because it is a testimony to Mark's gospel, as embodying the teaching of Peter—a testimony you see delivered almost in the same generation; for Justin Martyr wrote quite in the beginning of the second century. "\*Briefly, then, this is the sum of what Justin says of the memoirs, that is, the gospels, which he used. They were several, and yet one; they were called gospels; they contained a record of all things concerning Christ; they were known and admitted by Christians generally; they were read in their public services habitually with the books of the Old Testament; they were of apostolic authority, though not exclusively of apostolic authorship." Observe how very important that

\* Westcott, "The Bible in the Church," p. 102.

testimony is, as coming almost from the generation in which the gospels were written; and no one ventures to question the authenticity of the writings of Justin. It is to be remarked that he represents the Jewish adversary with whom he discourses, as also quite familiar with the gospels. The treatise is written in the form of a dialogue, which actually took place between himself and a Jewish adversary named Trypho. The Jew Trypho says,\* "I know that the precepts which are contained in that book which you call the gospels are so surprisingly strict and wonderful, that I really believe it to be impossible for any one to observe them exactly, for I had the curiosity to read them. But that which men most of all wonder at is, that you who pretend to be very religious, and think yourselves better than other men, do not excel them at all in anything; and that you do not in your lives and conversation differ in anything at all from the Gentiles, as ye neither observe the feasts nor the Sabbaths, neither are ye circumcised; and, moreover, though you put your trust in a man that was crucified, yet nevertheless you expect to receive good things from God, notwithstanding you do not keep his commandments." Any one who is at all familiar with the Judaizing opposition to the gospels which the Apostle Paul meets with so constantly in the Acts of the

\* "Justin Martyr's Dialogue with Trypho the Jew," Section xi.

Apostles, will see that this is the embodying of the Jewish hatred of Christianity, which, because the Christians were not circumcised, and did not keep the feasts, they considered was worthless. This is what he means by saying, "Notwithstanding you do not keep his commands." He goes on to say, "Have you not read that that soul shall be cut off from his people which shall not be circumcised on the eighth day, which command equally affects strangers and those that are bought with money."

Justin meets this in his own way, for in accordance with the views then entertained he throws the whole Mosaic law on one side, and says that Christians are not under the law, but under grace and under the gospel. "What service can that baptism be of which only cleanses the flesh, the body? But let anger, avarice, envy and hatred, be washed away from your souls, and behold the body is clean" (Sec. xiv.). The whole is very interesting, not only as a record of antiquity, but as strongly confirming from without the authenticity of the New Testament.

Another writer of the same age is Papias, the pastor of Hierapolis, in Phrygia, at the beginning of the second century. He represents a very different tone of thought to Justin. Papias belonged to the Judaizing section, and was at the same time very strongly imbued with millennarian views. Justin Martyr says that he thought those

who were entirely orthodox believed in the millenium, but that it was a point on which there was difference of opinion. Papias was an extravagant millennarian, but his testimony is very important as regards the Scriptures. It is Papias who says that the information he could draw from books was not so profitable as that which was preserved in a living tradition. I would not attach too much importance to his sentiments, as he was evidently rather a fanciful person, but his testimony is exceedingly strong. "Matthew," he said, "compiled the oracles in Hebrew." Notice the word, *the oracles*. You see at this very early period, the beginning of the second century, the gospels were accounted the oracles of God, less than a lifetime after the things took place. "Matthew compiled the oracles in Hebrew, but each one interpreted them as he was able." "This also," he writes, "the elder John used to say: 'Mark having become Peter's interpreter, wrote accurately all that he (Peter) mentioned, though he did not record in order that which was either said or done by Christ. For he neither heard the Lord nor followed him; but subsequently, as I said, attached himself to Peter, who used to frame his teaching to meet the wants of his hearers; and not as making a connected narrative of the Lord's discourses. So Mark committed no error, as he wrote down some particulars as he

(Peter) related them; for he took heed to one thing, to omit nothing of what he heard, and to state nothing falsely in his record.'” The way in which Papias expresses himself is of course interesting, but it is of no great importance except that it shows that according to the opinion of the church in that day, the gospels were not intended to be mere chronological lives of Christ, but were designed to preserve a summary of representative facts, given according to a moral and not a historical sequence, and to satisfy the requirements of those to whom the gospel was preached. That is to say, the Holy Ghost so guided the writers as to present not exactly a history according to our ideas, subject to the laws of historical criticism (being merely careful to put the things in order), but rather to present the facts in such a way as to be linked together for the godly edifying of the church. It is very important to remember this, because it explains many things. The great object was the glory of God and the instruction of the church, and not minute accuracy as regards the sequence of events, and the like, as we expect from a mere historian. Such was not the way in which the gospels were composed.

Justin says the Apocalypse was written by revelation by John, one of the apostles of Christ. I mention this, though it is a little out of order, because

of the early testimony to the Apocalypse, which book took longer to establish itself in some parts of the world, particularly in those to which it related, than other Scriptures; and here we have the very early testimony of Justin, who was certainly competent to form an opinion and to transmit it, not only that the Apocalypse was apostolical, but that the writer to whom it was given was St. John—a subject that has been very much controverted.

Shortly after the middle of the second century, every book was familiarly known, except perhaps 2 Peter, 2 and 3 John, and Jude. Then came, after this, a period of conflict against heresy, and the more definite formation consequently of what is called the canon. The word canon in Greek is descriptive of a carpenter's rule: a canon means a right rule; canonical means according to right rule. About this time Christians began to think more definitely what the books were that were canonical, and the canon of the New Testament began thus to be formed. A remarkable relic of antiquity was first published in 740—a MS. from the Ambrosian library in Milan. It treats upon this subject, and is supposed to have been written about 160 or 170 A.D. The author is unknown, and the fragment itself is mutilated. The work began no doubt with some remarks on Matthew, which are lost. It then goes on to speak of the gospel of Mark. Then follows

the gospel of Luke—the physician, the companion of Paul—which stands third. The fourth place is given to the gospel of John, a disciple of the Lord, which he wrote at the request of his fellow disciples and bishops, in obedience to a revelation given to the disciple Andrew, aided by the revision of all. What wonder then is it, the author adds, that John so constantly brings forward each detail even in his epistles, saying in his own person, ‘What we have seen with our eyes, and heard with our ears, and our hands have handled, these things have we written.’ For so he professes that he was not only an eye witness, but also a hearer, and, moreover, an historian of all the wonderful works of our Lord. Next to the gospels, the book of the Acts is mentioned as containing a record by Luke of what fell under his own observation. Thirteen epistles are attributed to St. Paul, of which nine were addressed to churches, and four to individual Christians. The first class suggests an analogy with the Apocalypse. As John, when writing for all Christendom, wrote specially to seven churches, so Paul also wrote by name only to seven churches, showing thereby the unity of the Catholic Church, though he wrote twice to the Corinthians and Thessalonians for their correction. The second class includes all the books which we receive, an epistle to Philomon, one to Titus, and two to Timothy, which, though



written only from personal feeling and affection, are still hallowed in the respect of the catholic church in the arrangement of ecclesiastical discipline. Moreover, it is said, there is in circulation an epistle to the Laodiceans, and another to the Alexandrians, under the name of Paul, bearing on the heresy of Marcion —(the heresy of Marcion was composed of those who valued the epistles of Paul over all the others of the New Testament—*ultra Paulites*, if one may so speak; the heresy arose about 106 or 107 A.D.) —and several others which cannot be received into the catholic church. For gall ought not to be mixed with honey. The epistle of Jude, however, and two epistles of John, who has been mentioned above, are held in the catholic church. We receive also the Apocalypses of John and Peter only, which some of our body will not have read in the church. After this mention is made of some other books—the Shepherd of Hermas, which is excluded from the collection, in which it already appears to have been placed by some—and of writings of Valentinus, Basilides, and others, of whom the writer says, “We receive nothing.” And so the fragment ends abruptly in the middle of an unfinished sentence.

A good many of the fragments are collected together of these books of no authority,\* but which

\* “*Spicilegium Patrum ut et Hereticorum*,” *Seculi i. ii. et iii.*, Grabius, 1714.

no doubt date from a very early period, and were excluded by the good spiritual sense of the Church. They certainly were deserving of exclusion—the gospel according to the Hebrews, the gospel according to the Egyptians, a pretended letter of Abgarus to Christ, and his answer, the Apocalypse of Peter, the Acts of Paul and Theckla, were very properly excluded from the canon of the New Testament.

Immediately subsequent to that period, we find again three writers whose testimony is very important. Irenæus wrote about the latter period of the century. He was trained under Polycarp, and speaks of the Old and New Testament as of equal dignity. Next comes Clement, of Alexandria, who says that his writings “contain only the shadow and outline of what he had heard from men who preserved the true tradition of the blessed doctrine directly from Peter and James, from John and Paul, the holy apostles, from father to son, even to our time.” Like Irenæus, he dwells on “the harmony of the law and prophets, the gospels and the epistles, and that under-current of melody which flows on from teacher to teacher, through all the changes of persons.” “The rule of the Church,” he says, “by which Scripture is interpreted consists in the perfect combination of all the notes and harmonies of the law and the prophets, with the Testament delivered

at the presence of the Lord. For in all the Scriptures in the law, in the prophets, and in the blessed gospel, which are ratified by almighty power, we have the Lord as the spring of our teaching, who, by the various ministrations of his servants in sundry times and in divers manners, from beginning to end, guides the course of knowledge, ruling all their words by a wise economy, to suit the age and culture of those who heard them."

These sentiments are beautifully expressed. Tertullian, bishop of the North African Church, and of the same age, is equally interesting in his testimony to the Scriptures. He appeals to the historic traditions of the churches, to show the authenticity of the apostolic writings. "If," he says, "it is acknowledged that that is more true which is more ancient; that more ancient which is even from the beginning; that from the beginning which is from the apostles, it will in like manner assuredly be acknowledged, that that has been delivered by the apostles, which has been preserved inviolate in the churches of the apostles." So he goes on to say at length, *the epistles of Paul have been preserved in the churches which he founded*; so, too, the four gospels have been handed down to us in due succession, on the authority of the apostolic churches. "These," he adds, "are the summary arguments which we employ when we discuss the Gospels with

heretics, maintaining both the order of time, which excludes the later works of forgers, and the authority of churches, which uphold the tradition of the apostles; because truth necessarily precedes forgery, and proceeds from those to whom it has been delivered." "And then," he proudly adds elsewhere, "in the possession of the New Testament *I am the heir of the apostles,*" which is a noble thought, just what any Christian might say. All that the apostles thought worth leaving he was heir to: he had the New Testament and their united testimony.

This was about the end of the second century. I should like to have said something about the Syrian version, made about the same time, and the old Vulgate, which is very important in connection with our English version, and also about Pamphilus, who formed a Christian library in A.D. 309, but I must pass on to the persecution of Diocletian, which commenced in the year 303. Now this persecution of Diocletian, like that of Antiochus Epiphanes as regards the Jews, was directed against the holy books as well as against the people. Both Antiochus Epiphanes, who tried to root out the Jews, and Diocletian, who tried to root out the Christians, thought that if they could destroy the holy books they could do much to abolish the religion. And so the decree of Diocle-

tian was, that the churches should be razed and the Scriptures consumed with fire. When a man was brought before the magistrate the question was, whether he would give up the sacred books—that is, the New Testament Scriptures. Those who gave them up were called *Traditores*—traitors, and branded by the whole Christian community, so strongly indeed, that this gave rise to a sect of Donatists, who showed extreme severity to those who failed in the hour of trial and persecution. But you will observe that these very persecutions made Christians cling the more closely to the Scriptures, and also more strongly disposed to preserve the right can<sup>on</sup> of the New Testament. It is obvious that if a man gave up the “Shepherd of Hermas” and other books that were of no authority, he was not in such a position as he who gave up the New Testament. The question would arise, Has he given up the real gospels? and this led to a similar result to that which took place under the Old Testament: the increased value placed upon the Scriptures themselves.

This brings us to the era when the most ancient MSS. still extant of the New Testament were written. Of these the most ancient is probably the *Codex Sinaiticus*, which was obtained by Tischendorf from the convent of St. Catherine, Mount Sinai, in A.D. 1859. The New Testament is here

entire, and the Epistle of Barnabas, and parts of the Shepherd of Hermas, are added. The whole MS. was published in 1862 by Tischendorf, at the expense of the Emperor of Russia. A cheap edition of this New Testament in common Greek character has been lately published in 8vo, by Williams and Norgate, London. It is doubtful whether the Vatican MS. is more or less ancient than the last mentioned. The edition published by Cardinal Mai in 1857 is beautifully, and, I believe, correctly executed, although the Cardinal did not live to complete his task, and the MS. is incomplete, and supplied from other MSS. The whole from the middle of Hebrews ix. to the end of Revelation is wanting. Happily the commencing portion of Hebrews ix. remains, and gives us an important and certainly correct text, which restores the golden censer to its true place in the *holy*, and not in the *most holy* place of the sanctuary.

There is strong internal evidence that this was written by an Egyptian Christian, and that it could not be later than the period we are speaking of. The mistakes in copying are those which would be made by a person acquainted with the Semitic class of languages, and not those into which an European transcriber would fall.

The testimony after this era is not, of course, so important, though it is interesting as showing

what questions arose in the churches as to the authenticity of particular books, especially those I have mentioned. I would refer to the decree of Constantine a little later. When he came to the imperial throne, and patronized Christianity, he said, as regards Constantinople:—"In the city which bears our name, by the help of the providence of God our Saviour, a very great multitude of men have attached themselves to the most holy church. Since everything there is increasing most rapidly, it appears very fitting that more churches should be constructed in the city. Wherefore welcome with all zeal the judgment which we have formed. For it appeared becoming to us to signify to your wisdom that you bid fifty copies of the divine Scriptures (he is writing to Eusebius) to be written on prepared skins, by skilled scribes who are well acquainted with their craft. For this purpose," he adds, "orders have been issued to the governor of the province to furnish everything required for the work;" and authority was given to Eusebius to employ two public carriages for the speedy conveyance of the books when finished to the emperor.

I must now very briefly touch on one or two points in conclusion. I would mention a MS. of the Syriac Bible found at Travancore, in the possession of the Syrian Christians at the foot of the mountain. I notice this not for the importance of the MS.

so much as in connection with our interest, in retracing the very early labours of those who introduced Christianity in that part of the world, and so carefully guarded the MSS. that they counted the letters in each of the books of the New Testament.

The testimony of the church is not as pure and clear in all ages as could be wished ; very far from it. I have not brought before you the decisions of councils, for they were utterly worthless as regards this point. The Church of Rome has done much to add to and to take away from the Word of God—to bring in the Apocrypha, as the result of the current of thought which began with Clement and extended down to the time of the Reformation, when the Protestants entered a protest against it. The doctrines of the Reformers were then drawn up by the Romanists at the Council of Trent to be censured. One of these doctrines was as follows :—

“That the Divine Scripture is most easy and perspicuous, and that to understand it neither gloss nor commentary is necessary, but only to have the spirit of a sheep of Christ’s pasture.”—*Polano’s Council of Trent*, p. 141.

This is a noble sentiment. That is to say, mere hard dry criticism, which the cleverest men in the world can produce, will never find its way into the real meaning of Scripture. A heart sanctified by



divine grace is far more likely to arrive at the truth than the greatest possible intellectual endowments ; and the true basis on which the reception of the books of the New Testament rests, and also their canonical authority is this, that Christians have the spirit of sheep of Christ's pasture, and can comprehend for themselves the ground on which these books have been received. They know full well their divine authority by personal experience, and that after all is the best confirmation.

I cannot impart to any the renewed convictions of my own mind in going over the subject—the sense I have of the inexpressible strength of these bulwarks of our faith—the feeling that they never can be overthrown. Whilst at the same time the inward evidence of the spiritual understanding of the Christian is even far more decisive and satisfactory than all the array of external confirmation.

I conclude with the sentiments of a later writer, John of Damascus, who wrote thus after giving a catalogue of the Scriptures :—

“The law and the prophets, evangelists and apostles, and shepherds and teachers spake,” he says, “by the Holy Spirit. All inspired Scripture, therefore, is wholly profitable. So that it is best and most profitable for the soul to search the divine Scriptures. Let us then knock that we may enter that fairest paradise ; . . . but let us not

knock carelessly, but rather with zeal and steadfastness. Let us not faint in knocking; for then it shall be opened to us. . . . Let us draw from the fountains of Paradise perennial and most pure streams springing up into eternal life. . . . But if we can gather anything useful from other sources without it is not forbidden. Let us show ourselves tried money-changers, storing up the genuine and pure gold, but declining the base.”

This last sentence refers to an expression said by one of those unauthenticated writers to have been an expression of our Lord. At all events, the sentiment is beautifully expressed, and is well worthy of consideration.) Let us draw from the perennial stream, and reject that which has no authority or worth.

## LECTURE IV.

### COLENZO AND HIS DIFFICULTIES.

I WISH it to be understood that in bringing before you Bishop Colenso and his difficulties, I desire to continue the argument I have presented to your notice in the preceding lectures—the necessary connection between the witnesses for God, the power of the Holy Spirit accompanying them, and the Scriptures delivered into their hands.

It seems to me most evident that the worth of a religion must necessarily be tested by the character of those who bear witness to that religion, and that God has always acted in accordance with this principle, so deeply implanted in the mind of man, and so necessary a part of our constitution. When any one therefore comes forward to impugn our holy religion, or to seek to shake the evidences of the faith once delivered to the saints, we must necessarily inquire what are the testimonials of the man who thus presents himself to our notice? Is such an individual distinguished by his love to the souls

of men, by his apostolic character, and by such a consistency of life and conversation as become one whose testimony should be to us of great weight.

Now Bishop Colenso addresses the masses of the people in "the people's edition" of his book, hoping, if possible, to persuade the laity of the Church of England (as he has not had much success as yet with the ecclesiastical portion), to 'rise up and assist him in reforming the Church of England in his own way. His views are therefore obtruded upon the notice of all in this country. Moreover, I have had sent me a sermon, addressed by the same bishop to the Claybrook Sunday-school, before the children of which he develops his views and presses them upon their attention.\* In this sermon the bishop gives the sort of views which, according to his reformed religion, will be pressed upon even the children of our Sunday-schools. In the fourth page he speaks of Jephthah's rash vow. Having referred to certain passages in the prophetic books, he says:—"From all this you will see that the practice of offering human sacrifices was indeed *very common among the Jews* (!) in the lifetime of the prophets Jeremiah and Ezekiel. And so too we read of Jephthah the Gileadite offering his only

\* The sermon is adapted for wide circulation, and is stated to be supplied singly at twopence—twelve copies free by post.

child, a daughter, as a burnt-offering unto the Lord, on his return home from a great victory."

The above is an example of the bishop's style of *assuming* things quietly as proven when it suits his purpose, for this question has been differently viewed by the greatest critics, Jewish and Christian, who have taken opposite views of it. One of these, Dr. Lightfoot, who had by far more knowledge of Hebrew literature than probably any other person not a Jew that ever lived, took different views at different times of his life. Whatever may be the truth in this particular instance, it could only be adduced by a very faulty logic, to prove the frequency of human sacrifices 700 years before Jephtha's era. "You will now be able to understand," says the bishop, "more clearly the meaning of the passage which I have taken for my text, and the lessons which we are to draw from the story here set before us out of the *lifetime of the patriarch Abraham*. This chapter seems to explain the great struggle of mind through which good men of old had to pass before they came at last to abolish this horrible practice of human sacrifice! You may have often wondered, when you heard it read, that so good a man as Abraham should have ever thought that he could please God by slaying his son and offering him as a burnt-offering. And you must have been still more surprised to hear it said that

God did tempt Abraham by giving him a direct command to do this—to do what the laws of God and man, as well as the strongest instincts of paternal love, most positively and utterly forbid. *How far this story is literally true, and describes what really happened in the life of Abraham, we cannot say.*”

And then he proceeds to refer to a parable of our Lord, as implying that it was a mere story, and he says that some prophet may have described this “occurrence in the life of their great forefather Abraham; whether it ever really happened or not exactly as it is here described *does not at all matter* for the lessons which may be drawn from it. . . . What the writer really means when he says that God did tempt Abraham by giving him such a command is most probably this—that the thought arose in Abraham’s heart, in the main a *good pious thought*, and, therefore, so far inspired by God’s Spirit, that he must hold back nothing from God which God required of him,” etc. “But Abraham’s *mistake*—at least the *mistake* ASCRIBED TO HIM IN THIS STORY—was that of supposing that *this particular act was commanded by God*—that God really wished him to kill his son and sacrifice him.” (!!)

Now I should suppose that children taught in this way would say that indeed “it does not at all matter,” but that they clearly understood it was all

false from beginning to end, and that they might go and please God by telling lies in the same way. Is not this the evident inference that would be drawn by children of Sunday schools taught on such principles as these? It is necessary, therefore, to consider a little how the bishop came by such extraordinary views. He gives us a portion of his religious history in the preface, and shows us that the effect of contact with heathenism was to set his mind inquiring on subjects he never seems to have considered before as regards the foundation of his faith; and instead of being able to answer questions put to him by the Zulu people, some of which you would think likely to be put by any intelligent Sunday scholar to his teacher, he found himself entirely at a loss. He describes the questions of a Zulu native to him about the laws regulating slavery among the Jews, and seems to say that he could find no answer to them. Now one might imagine that an ordinary Sunday-school teacher, if asked such a question by the children, would be able to say, "You are told by the blessed Lord himself, that the law was but a transitory and imperfect dispensation, and that many things were allowed the people for the hardness of their hearts which were not approved of God; for example, polygamy, which was practised among them, and was not forbidden by the law, but of which our

Lord says that from the beginning it was not so—that is, it was not according to the mind of God, his will, his gracious pleasure, as regards the family of man, but was permitted to them by Moses for the hardness of their hearts.”

Then, again, as regards the flood and the contents of Noah’s ark, questions which any child might wish to have answered. He says that, having obtained greater knowledge of geology since he had left England, he had learned that the flood could not have taken place, and more especially that some of the mountains of Auvergne, in France, could not have borne the wasting away of the waters of the flood. One would have supposed that he would have attempted to teach the Zulus that God could do anything—perform a miracle if He pleased, and even make the pumice-stones endure the washing of the flood on the mountains of Auvergne; but that does not seem to have been his view, and so he finished by being convinced of the unhistorical, that is to say, the fictitious character of the Pentateuch. More than that, he was afraid he should not be able to require from others a solemn declaration that they do unfeignedly believe all the canonical Scriptures of the Old and New Testament. He began then to tremble at the result of his inquiries, particularly as the flood is mentioned in the baptismal service of the Church of England; as



consequently he would have to require of the clergy to state, as often as they christened a child, what they might not believe. Having arrayed himself in the now somewhat rent and patched lion's skin of German neology, it would have been his wisdom to have held his peace as regards his own religious history. The present position of the Bishop appears to be fraught with more peril to the interests of Christianity than might have resulted from his renunciation of his bishoprick and his actual initiation into another religion. The world would certainly then have been startled into a conviction of his sincerity, which it does not yet possess, but would with difficulty have been induced to believe that *the great Teacher reveals the deep things of God in Mohammedanism as in all other religions* (Comp. p. 94). They would more likely have ascribed such a change to the influence of the great Deceiver.

However, as he has favoured us thus far with his autobiography, I notice, in the first place, that Colenso started with a most untenable view of the Scriptures, leaving out of sight altogether the human element, which, as well as the divine, is so manifest in Scripture. He says: "There was a time in my own life when I thought thus, and could heartily have subscribed to such language as the following, which BURGON ("Inspiration," etc., p. 89) asserts to be the creed of orthodox Christians at the present day—

The Bible is none other than the *voice of Him that sitteth upon the throne!* Every book of it—every chapter of it—every verse of it—every word of it—every syllable of it—where are we to stop?—every *letter* of it, is the direct utterance of the Most High! The Bible is none other than the Word of God—not some part of it more, some part of it less, but all alike, the utterance of Him who sitteth upon the throne — absolute, faultless,<sup>1</sup> unerring, supreme.”

Now I need scarcely say to you that this is a very hyperbolical and inflated way of expressing that the Scriptures are the oracles of God; but it loses sight entirely of the human element. Put that statement side by side with the commission we find in 2 Timothy:—“The cloak that I left at Troas, with Carpus, when thou comest bring with thee, and the books, but especially the parchments.” This is, of course, a part of the Word of God. One might almost, indeed, see the divine wisdom of allowing such a statement to be there, if it were only to counteract such a hyperbolical expression as this. There is the human element as well as the divine, and the Apostle’s attention to these little but important sublunary matters is very instructive. But starting with this exaggerated view, it is not so much to be wondered at that Colenso came round entirely to the opposite point of the compass. He

says, speaking of the danger to some who would make a bad use of this new form of Christianity,—  
“‘The unrighteous will be unrighteous still; the filthy will be filthy still.’ The heart that is unclean and impure will not fail to find excuse for indulging its lusts, from the notion that somehow the very principle of a living faith in God is shaken because belief in the Pentateuch is shaken. But it is not so. Our belief in the living God would remain as sure as ever *though not the Pentateuch only, but the whole Bible were removed*. It is written on our hearts by God’s own finger, as surely as by the hand of the Apostle in the Bible, that God is and is a rewarder of them that diligently seek Him” (p. 27 Introduction). The fact *is*, that so far from all being naturally written on the heart, not even half the first verse of the Book of Genesis is written on people’s hearts. “*In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth.*” The first three words in Hebrew contain more knowledge than all heathendom put together ever arrived at. “*In the beginning God created.*” Whatever may be vaguely spoken, as by the Chinese of “heaven,” they do not believe in the existence of a Divine Being before and apart from his creation. They do not understand *God creating*. So that the Bishop’s “inward light,” or inward revelation, when put to the test of fact, as many of us know very well, comes to just

nothing at all. But this appears to be his own religion—his own royal creed, that is to say, the doctrine of *inward light*—the old doctrine which in many ways has come up from the earliest ages, but which never, that I know of, taught the necessity of bishops or ecclesiastical systems, but rather the contrary. So he says of the new gospel, if we may call it so:—(p. 68 first part) “Let us rather teach them to look for and discern the sign of God’s Spirit speaking to them in the Bible, in that of which their own hearts alone can be the judges, of which the heart of the simple child can judge as well as—often, alas! better than—that of the self-willed philosopher, critic, or sage, in that which speaks to *the witness for God within them*, the reason and conscience, to which alone, under God himself, whose voice it utters in the secrets of his inner being, each man is ultimately responsible. Let us bid them look for it in that within the Bible which tells them of what is pure and good, holy and loving, faithful and true, which speaks from God’s spirit directly to their spirits, though clothed with the outward form of a law, or parable, or proverb, or narrative,” etc. Then he says again:—“Let us teach men to recognize the voice of God’s Spirit, in whatever way, by whatever ministry, He vouchsafes to speak to the children of men; and to realize the solid comfort of the thought that, not only in

the Bible, not to us Christians only, but to our fellow-men of *all* climes and countries, ages and *religions*, the same gracious Teacher is revealing, in different measures, according to his own pleasure, the hidden things of God." He goes on to show that in all religions are revealed the hidden things of God. He quotes Cicero, and the Sikh Goo-roos in the East Indies, and the Gallas of North-eastern Africa, and speaks of their prayers as inspired. Then he says:—"Thus then, while we are sure that the 'Word of God' will be heard oftentimes by the pious heart in the utterance of heathen men—just as we know there are passages in the apocryphal writings," etc. Now it is a curious thing that in speaking of some writers fabricating a part of the Old Testament, he speaks of them as "inspired by God's Holy Spirit" to commit this odious deception, showing the lack of morality of which this system allows—a system that has no sort of criterion of what is truth but what a man happens to feel as the impulse of his own mind. Thus finding himself in difficulties about his religious belief he went, not to prayer; he did not resort to that most necessary fountain of all blessings, since "every good gift and perfect gift cometh down from above, from the *Father of lights*;" and if any one is in difficulties about his faith he can do no better than "ask of God, who giveth to all men liberally and upbraideth

not." Instead of that, he never speaks of prayer for divine direction, but he asks his friends to send him some German critical works. He went, in fact, to what is sometimes called "the higher criticism."

He says (Preface, p. 13):—"Some, indeed, may be ready to say of this book as the Quarterly says of the Essayists, 'the whole apparatus is drawn bodily from the German Rationalists.' This, however, is not the case; and I will at once state plainly to what extent I have been indebted to German sources in the original composition of this work. Having determined that it was my duty without loss of time to engage myself thoroughly in the task of examining into the foundations of the current belief in the historical credibility of the Mosaic story, I wrote to a friend in England, and requested him to send me some of the best books for entering on such a course of study, begging him to forward to me books on both sides of the question, both the bane and the antidote. He sent me two German works, EWALD ('Geschichte des Volkes Israel,' 7 vols.), and KURTZ ('History of the Old Covenant,' 3 vols.), the former in German, the latter an English translation." He then describes how he studied these. Now the character of the German mind is particularly shown in their theology, which has obtained great currency in many quarters. This character of mind is well described

by a certain writer, who supposes a case of three men, one a Frenchman, another English, another German. They were each asked to describe a camel. The Frenchman went to the museum of the Jardin des Plantes, at Paris, borrowed two or three volumes, set to work, and composed a very elaborate and elegant treatise, and said "*Le voilà le chameau.*" The Englishman packed up bag and baggage, spent a considerable time on his travels, and came back with a vast amount of information, which he arranged in a very ill-digested book, very useful, but not readable. The German set to work constructing a camel from intuition, showing what a camel ought to be, reasoning it out in his own mind, and he has been studying it ever since. When he will produce the camel nobody knows. That is the sort of thing we have to deal with in this higher criticism.\*

One of the writers to whom Bishop Colenso referred is Ewald, of whose views I take the following summary from "Smith's Dictionary":—"Ewald stands quite alone, and it is not likely that he will find any disciple bold enough to adopt his theory. Even his great admirer, *Bunsen*, forsakes him here. But it is due to Ewald's great and deserved reputation as a scholar, and to his uncommon critical sagacity, briefly to state what that view is.

\* See Appendix A.

He distinguishes, then, *seven* different authors in the great book of Origenes, or Primitive History, comprising the Pentateuch and Joshua. The oldest historical work, of which but a very few fragments remain, is the book of the wars of Jehovah. Then follows a biography of Moses, of which also but small portions have been preserved. The third and fourth documents are much more perfect. These consist of the book of the Covenant, which was written in the time of Samson, and the book of Origenes, which was written by a priest in the time of Solomon. Then comes in the fifth place the third historian of the primitive times, or the first prophetic narrator, a subject of the northern kingdom in the days of Elijah or Joel. The sixth document is the work of the fourth historian of primitive times, or the second prophetic narrator, who lived between 800 and 750. Lastly comes the fifth historian, or third prophetic narrator, who flourished not long after Joel, and who collected and reduced into one corpus the various works of his predecessors. The real purpose of the history, both in its prophetical and its legal aspects, began now to be discerned. Some steps were taken in this direction by an unknown writer at the beginning of the seventh century, B.C., and then in a far more comprehensive manner by the Deuteronomist, who flourished in the time of Manassch, and lived in Egypt. In the



time of Jeremiah appeared the poet who wrote the blessing of Moses, as it is given in Deuteronomy. A somewhat later editor incorporated the originally independent work of the Deuteronomist, and the lesser additions of his two colleagues, with the history as left by the fifth narrator, and thus the whole was finally completed. *Such were the strange fortunes which this great work underwent before it reached its present form !*"

This is one of the German teachers of the bishop. Kurtz is another, one of the leading German writers, who is considered to be truly Christian, and writes with more reverence than some others. • He says:—"From the results of my investigations, I have formed to myself the following idea of the mode of formation of the Pentateuch. The kernel or basis of it was written by Moses himself in *the Covenant Roll*, which is now worked into the history of law-giving in Exodus xix.—xxiv. The other laws of the Sinaitic desert, till they reached the plains of Moab, were delivered by Moses orally ; but they were committed to writing by the priests, within whose province this lay. Since Deuteronomy does not at all imply the existence of the whole older legislation in writing, but rather recapitulates it with great freedom, we need not assume that the actual codification took place already during the march through the wilderness. It was completed,

however, soon after taking possession of Canaan. Upon the soil of the Holy Land the history of Israel began first to be written, having now reached a resting-point; the historical description of the Mosaic times necessitated of itself the writing down of the Mosaic legislation in its whole extent. A man such as Eleazer, the son of Aaron the priest, wrote the great work beginning 'In the beginning,' etc., in which he included the Covenant Roll, and perhaps inserted only short notices about the last discourses of Moses, since Moses had written them down with his own hand. A second, such as Joshua, one who was a prophet, and spake as a prophet, or one of those elders upon whom the spirit of Moses rested, and many of whom outlived Joshua, completed this work—not, of course, from the impulse of his own will, nor merely out of an inward call, but under some kind of authorization, and incorporated it in the whole of Deuteronomy, upon which he had formed his own mind. *Somewhat in this way* arose the Law, not without the employment of other written documents by both writers."

And now the rather awkward fact (in my view) comes out, that the bishop has taken into his confidence, and apparently quotes with great respect, in a sort of preface to his second part, the following sentiments of a Roman Catholic priest, Dr. Geddes: "The Hebrew Scriptures I have examined and

appreciated, as I would any other writings of antiquity ; and I have bluntly and honestly delivered my sentiments of their merit or demerit, their beauties or imperfections, as becomes a free and impartial examiner. I am well aware that this freedom will, by the many, be considered as an audacious licence, and the cry of *heresy ! infidelity ! irreligion !* will resound from shore to shore. But my peaceful mind has been long prepared for, and indeed accustomed to, such harsh Cerberean barkings ; and experience has made me (not naturally insensible) callous to every injury that ignorance or malice may have in store for me.” Then he goes on to quote from the same Roman Catholic priest, showing that he has no more reason to believe in the stories of Genesis than in the legends and lies of Dr. G.’s own church ! Now this partnership is very suggestive, because nothing is more important to that unhappy church than to shake the authority of the Scriptures in any way they possibly can. I do not like the companionship in which the bishop finds himself here. You will perhaps think there must be some foundation for the above extraordinary suppositions ; but really it is not necessary to suppose any foundation at all, since the higher criticism soars far above all considerations of respect and reverence for God’s Word, and all the *dicta* of common sense. Reliable human testimony, sufficient to establish a title to an

earthly inheritance, counts as nothing when brought before its self-constituted and self-conceited tribunal.

Passing over any further investigations of Colenso's views, I must say that he is not at all candid in not admitting that the same line of argument by which he assails the Pentateuch might be directed against the whole Scriptures, and against the very being and existence of God. As regards the same line of argument indeed being directed against the New Testament, he is quite prepared for this, and all the consequences resulting from it.\* I must therefore regard this bishop as pre-eminently disqualified for the task he has undertaken. He has not the spirit of the sheep of Christ's pasture, which the Reformers stated to be the greatest qualification for understanding the Scriptures. The Scriptures require the most prayerful study, and above all things the spirit of humility and subjection to God. The bishop, in considering the question which I raised in the preceding lecture as to the authority of our Lord, as pledged to the Pentateuch, to the law at least as written by Moses, disposes of this by saying,† that

\* "Is there then a *dark chamber* here too which we are afraid to examine (he says)—into which we dare not suffer the light of day to enter?" See further in p. 181, Part III.

† See Preface to Part I., p. 20, "*Colenso on the Pentateuch*," People's Edition.

our Lord cannot be supposed to have had more knowledge than the great men of the nation, and that in fact the bishop's own view of it is that Christ was mistaken. Nevertheless the disciple is not above his Master, nor the servant above his Lord.

To pass on, then, to the difficulties in which the bishop finds himself, and the conclusions to which with the help of his German friends he has arrived—conclusions which will perhaps surprise some. He thinks that the books of Moses were not written by him at all, but by the prophet Samuel, who when retired from the cares of government could not find any better occupation than that of composing a romance on the early history of Israel, having no more pretence to authenticity than the writings of Defoe, or of any modern novelist. In this he thinks he was aided by some of the sons of the prophets, who were as promising young hypocrites as could be desired (p. 130), and that his attention was so much absorbed, that he let his family run wild, and nevertheless blundered so much over his production as not even to be able to give the appearance of consistency to his narrative (Part II., pp. 114, 115). In order to elevate the minds of the Hebrews he had recourse to a pious fraud, and forged a lie in the name of the Lord in order to introduce the name Jehovah, which was before unknown except as the name of the

Phenician sun god IAO\* (pp. 120, 159, 160). I may say, in passing, that there is not the slightest ground for this extraordinary statement. He thinks that in this lying compilation there is some small mixture of truth, which may be discovered by means of the inward intuition. And yet this was, in the bishop's opinion, "a noble effort" (Part II., pp. 150, 151), and he asks, "Is there anything immoral or dishonest in such an act?" moreover, in all this he may have been *moved by the Holy Ghost*. This is the most extraordinary statement of all (Part II., p. 154). He says, "There is nothing therefore to prevent our believing that Samuel also, or the Elohist, whoever he may have been, was '*moved by the Holy Ghost*,' while he strove to teach his people, by the examples of their forefathers, set before them in a life-like story, full of moral and religious significance, though *not historically true*, the duty of fearing God (!) and trusting in Him, and loving and serving Him." And then a little further on, he says (p. 155):—"But some one perhaps may now say, 'Do you then take from us God's Word, the Bible?' I must reply again, 'Whatever is done, it is not I, but the truth, which does it,' etc. Thus far relates to the first four books of Moses. As to

\* Which is a name of probably comparatively recent invention, its first mention being in a verse of one of the Judaizing Gnostics.

Deuteronomy, the'bishop has made it certain to his own mind that it was the work of Jeremiah the prophet, and that "the writing of the book, the placing it, and the finding it were pretty nearly contemporaneous events." This Jeremiah did by the help of Huldah the prophetess, Shaphan, and Hilkiah, in order to effect a reformation (III., p. 196). Taking advantage of the youth of the King Josiah in order to impress his mind with religious sentiments, he induced him to keep the celebrated Passover, but after that Passover Josiah began to think that something was not quite right, and we never hear of his keeping it again. This was all deception, but nevertheless done, he says, at the dictates of the inner voice.

I do not think you would wish me to follow any further the discussion of the views of the bishop, except as regards the most admirable answers that have been made to his objections. I have read some of them with the greatest satisfaction and interest. It is particularly pleasing to find the intelligence of the working classes arrayed on the side of Scripture, and I therefore mention, in the first place, an examination of the bishop's arguments by two working men, entitled "The Bible in the Workshop." Next, the book of Dr. Cumming, "Moses Right and Colenso Wrong," is a most admirable, popular work, quite accessible

to the generality of readers. I have here another volume published by the Religious Tract Society, and entitled "The Exodus of Israel," by the Rev. T. R. Birks, who is certainly one of the most profound thinkers in the present generation. Then there is a publication by Dr. Alexander M'Caul, late professor of Hebrew in King's College, entitled "An Examination of Bishop Colenso's Difficulties with regard to the Pentateuch." It is an admirable book, and is not merely an official answer, but entirely disposes of the difficulties which have been raised.

There are one or two points on which I have my own views, which I may bring before you afterwards ; at present I may remark that this small volume of Dr. M'Caul's—the author being a distinguished Hebraist—most entirely demonstrates that the bishop's Hebrew is as little to be confided in as his arithmetic. Still this seems to be a confirmation of the words of Scripture, which declares the wisdom of this world is foolishness with God, for it is written, "He taketh the wise in their own craftiness." I will take up the *résumé* of Dr. M'Caul's arguments to show you that he has entered fully into the question :—

"Thus the examination of Bishop Colenso's objections has only proved that there is nothing in them to affect the historic character which the Pentateuch has hitherto enjoyed, and still less to shake that faith in its divine origin, which is



common to the Jewish people and the whole Christian Church. There are only two difficulties which appear serious; the first of them has been solved by the undoubted fact that the expression 'going or coming down into Egypt' is, according to the author's usage, applicable to those born in that country; and by the equally certain fact that the narrative makes Judah older than Dr. Colenso supposes him to be. The second difficulty, that of the sustentation of the cattle in the wilderness, is removed by the probable changes which may have occurred in the peninsula of Sinai since the days of Moses, and by the Scripture references to God's mercy in sending his people rain whilst in the wilderness."

The reference Dr. M'Caul makes to other parts of Scripture are very interesting here. So great is the effect of rain in the transformation of the desert that I was told by a gentleman that he had stretched himself, on a bed of anemones in this "terrible wilderness" betwixt Egypt and Sinai at that particular time of the year, in which the children of Israel were led out at the Passover. Whenever there is rain, the wilderness puts on the aspect of verdant beauty. And we are told in the sixty-eighth Psalm, "Thou, O God, *didst send a plentiful rain* to refresh thine inheritance when it was weary." Dr. M'Caul says:—

“ The other difficulties rest on doubtful premises, unwarranted assumptions, defective information, and even on what in ordinary men would be considered want of common sense. Those derived from the size of the tabernacle and camp, and the priests’ duties, if not urged in earnest by a man of education, would be pronounced silly; that from the small number of priests and the amount of their duties, not much better. The difficulties found in the statement that all Israel was armed, or that so many lambs were to be killed in a very short space of time, are based upon Dr. Colenso’s own choice of the signification of words, concerning which no man living can pronounce with certainty. Similar is the objection about the sprinkling of the blood at the second passover. Whether the blood was sprinkled or not, is still a matter of controversy. Dr. Colenso’s objection rests simply on his asserting as a certainty that which is doubtful. That his authority is sufficient to turn the scale in matters of doubt, is not proved by the fact that his difficulties about the priest carrying the bullock, the Israelites dwelling in booths, and the institution and celebration of the passover on the same day, proceed from want of accurate acquaintance with the Hebrew language. The objections derived from the shekel of the sanctuary and the poll tax, are made plausible only by omitting important words of the texts on which he

\*  
founds the objections. The assertion that Joshua could not be heard when reading the law, proceeds partly from want of a common-sense view of the narrative, mainly from ignorance of the locality where Joshua and the tribes stood. The difficulties about the night of the first passover, and the march out of Egypt, rest on the false assumption that the Israelites went out at a moment's notice, contrary to the whole tenor of the narrative. That with regard to the numbers of the first-born is made out by taking the word *B'kor* in a sense not known in Scripture. The apparently grand difficulty as to the number of the Israelites, Danites, and Levites, rests firstly upon the false assertion that all Israel went out in the fourth generation; secondly, upon the unwarranted assumption that the sixty-nine progenitors of Israel had no children after they went down into Egypt, and the consequently incorrect rate of increase adopted; that from the war with Midian, from forgetfulness of what has been effected in war in our own time. Such difficulties, resting on such slender foundations, would not affect the historic character of any ancient writing, much less of that wonderful Book, whose genuineness is attested by an unbroken series of Hebrew writers, and avouched by the infallible testimony of the Son of God."

Dr. M'Caul devotes the remainder of this little

book to tracing down the Pentateuch from the present time to the days of Joshua, and step by step proves, in a way that I should scarcely have thought possible—at least as regards some of the steps—by a most masterly piece of historical criticism, the undoubted and unquestioned authority and identity of the Pentateuch—that is of the books of Moses according to our English translation. There is no sort of question, that with the exception of one or two words of comparatively no importance, which were pointed out by Dr. Lightfoot long ago, the Pentateuch is the same; and therefore I think we have reason to thank God for this criticism, and for others, which in my opinion have most abundantly disproved the objections which this bishop has most unhappily brought forward.

Amongst the matters which have occurred to my own mind, I would mention one, and that is as regards the introduction of the word Jehovah. The writer of the book of Exodus says in the 6th chapter, that the Lord appeared to Moses and said unto him, “I am Jehovah;” and he appeared unto Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, by the name God Almighty, but “by my name Jehovah was I not known to them.” And yet it is evident from the whole tenor of the story that the word Jehovah was known before that time, insomuch that even the mother of Moses has

a name that is compounded of the word Jehovah.\* The following elucidation of this I take to be satisfactory to a spiritual mind; it is given as to its substance by the Jews themselves, who may be supposed to have a further knowledge of Hebrew than these German critics. The explanation given by two leading commentators of the passage, "By my name Jehovah was I not made known unto them," is as follows: *Rashi* says that it means, "I have not been known with my true attributes;" and still more explicitly *Abarbanel*, another great authority, says that it means, "I was not known and understood to them by my name Jehovah, though I appeared to them under that appellation, because they received their revelation not face to face, but through other mediums." The Jewish tradition immediately after the days of our Lord, is that our Lord performed his miracles—(it is a remarkable fact that the Jewish writers do not deny the miracles)—by giving the true pronunciation of the name Jehovah, which he had learned in Egypt. This has so far the *semblance* of truth, that we may

\* It is very well shown by M. Nicolas that the Mosaic economy was the unfolding of the character of Jehovah, and that all finds its centre therein. How impossible, then, to suppose that this could have been the invention of a period when that economy had been long established. It is as though some future critic should assert, that all English social and political organization was founded on Scott's novels.

truly say the knowledge of the name Jehovah—that is, communion with Him, knowing the Lord face to face—is the possession of a faith that lays hold of the power of the Lord. We read in Hebrews xi. that such and such things were done by faith—they passed through the Red Sea, etc. That was by the true knowledge of the name Jehovah.

It was, in all probability, sounded 'JAHVEH, or JAH, as we have it in our translation of Psalm lxxviii.—that grand commemorative description of the dealings of God—in which we find this verse (ver. 3), “Sing unto *Elohim*, sing praises to his name: extol Him that rideth upon the heavens by his name JAH, and rejoice before Him.” Again (ver. 11), “*Adonai* gave the word: great was the company of those that published it.” Again (ver. 14), “When *Shaddai* scattered kings for her.” Again, (ver. 16), “This is the hill which *Elohim* desireth to dwell in; yea, *Jehovah* will dwell in it for ever.” Finally, I would notice the central verse (ver. 18), which, referring to the ascension of Christ, concludes “that JAH *Elohim* might dwell among them.” So interchangeable are the sacred names in the Old Testament; and if capable of being thus used in concert in one Psalm, what becomes of all the speculations as to their use marking distinct writers and parties, and even *religions*, among the seed of Abraham?

Let any person capable of appreciating the beauties of poetry read the noble song of praise to Jehovah on the shores of the Red Sea, in Exodus xv., and say then whether it is not evident that it was composed on the occasion, and whether it is not indeed *full* of the newly-revealed glory of his name.

Another collateral point is as to the frequency of the occurrence of the compounded name. Jehovah is not the right pronunciation, for the Jews have concealed the vowels, and attached to the word the vowels belonging to the name Adonai.\* This name Jah constantly entering, after the Exodus, into the hearing of the people, they were accustomed to it as to a household word, and they compounded the names of their children with this sacred name more frequently at that time than before. What, then, does this point to? One may indeed make much of it by dint of the higher criticism, but it does not *prove* anything. The frequency with which names occur in ordinary conversation, or are brought into the composition of familiar words, does not at all *prove* the amount of sacredness belonging to the names or the thoughts and feelings of those who use them. Look, for instance, at the practice of the

\* "The Talmud enjoins, 'Even he who *thinks* the name of God with the true letters, forfeits his future life.'"—See *Kalisch. Exod.*, p. 53.

English nation. You do not find that we name our streets as is done in Romish countries. Such names as "The Holy Ghost Street," "Jesu Maria River," or "Holy Trinity City," are not familiar to us. We shrink from that sort of nomenclature, and why? The higher criticism might say that the Protestant people know nothing about these things, that their faith is simple Deism; and this would be as true an assertion as much that is said about the names compounded with Jehovah. The simple explanation is that where there is the most reverence there is often the least use of sacred names, for some reason that lies deep in the history of the human mind. I take this, therefore, to be the explanation of a difficulty which has been made a great deal of, but which appears to me to have nothing in it.

I must, however, hasten to a conclusion by laying before you very briefly what strikes my own mind especially in reference to the difficulties about the authorship of the Pentateuch.

I have no sort of doubt, I cannot for a moment question while I am a Christian, that "the law was given by Moses." That is sufficient for *me*, but if you desire further confirmation you have simply to look at the difficulties which have been raised and the manner in which those difficulties have been cleared away. There are Christians who still doubt about the book of Deuteronomy, and do not



seem to see that to sweep away the ascription of the authorship of Deuteronomy to Moses is quite destructive of any faith in Judaism or Christianity—that it altogether overthrows the foundation of our faith. For it is not the case with this as with many books of the Old and New Testaments, that the truth of their contents remains the same, though the authorship is unknown; since in Deuteronomy the whole is so woven together, and so expressly claimed as the work of Moses, that no alternative remains. It is either eminently “*his words*,” or it is the product of some audacious forger, who for the sake of a pious fraud, gave out his fictitious writings in order to produce a good effect on the faithful ones in Judah. So the book commences with “These be the words which *Moses* spake unto all Israel on this side Jordan;” and let it not be said these words came down by oral tradition, since the closing portion records, “And it came to pass, when *Moses* had made an end of *writing* the words of this law in a book, until they were finished, that Moses commanded the Levites, which bare the ark of the covenant of Jchovah, saying, Take *THIS book of the law*, and put it in the side of [or rather, by the side of\*] the ark of the covenant of the Lord.” It becomes from that time a sacred deposit, and is enjoined to be read every seven years,

\* See Ges. Lex. *in loc.* and the LXX.

“in the solemnity of the year of release, in the feast of tabernacles, when all Israel is come to appear before the Lord thy God in the place which He shall choose, thou shalt read *this law* before *all Israel* in their hearing. Gather the people together, *men*, and *women*, and *children*, and thy stranger that is within thy gates, that they may hear, and that they may learn, and fear Jehovah your God, and observe to do *all the words of this law*, and that their children which have not known may hear and learn to fear Jehovah your God as long as ye live in the land whither ye go over *Jordan* to possess it.” This is expressly said to be the word spoken by Moses, but according to the German theory, by a modern romancer, who by some unaccountable artifice managed to cause his romance to be received as genuine, amongst a people so studious of antiquity and so exact of observance as the Jews. Again this *false* Moses tells them that they had entered into covenant with the Lord, and that Jehovah had avouched them to be his peculiar people; that the results of this would be, if they were faithful, temporal blessings of the highest character; if unfaithful, dispersion into all the regions of the earth, and such a state of things as now exists, and which none but a prophet could have foreseen! This liar and cheat must then have been a prophet, alas! and yet bold enough to incorporate in his book a sentence

of death on the prophet who should speak presumptuously. Singularly, also, whilst occupied in his forgery, he introduces this exhortation: "Ye shall not add unto the word which I command you, neither shall ye diminish aught from it, that ye may keep the commandments of the Lord your God which I" (the pseudo Moses) "command you. For *your eyes* have seen" (though it happened 700 years ago) "what the Lord did because of Baal Peor," etc. He describes the land whither they were to go in to possess it, as contrasted with the land of Egypt which they had known; for he says he did not "speak to the children which had not known and had not seen the chastisement of Jehovah, their God, . . . and his miracles and his acts which He did in the midst of Egypt, and in the passage of the Red Sea, and in the wilderness, but *their eyes had seen* all the great acts of Jehovah which he did." He exhorts them consequently to be faithful, for *if they were so*, the Lord would lead them into Canaan, and give them a breadth of possessions in it which they *never yet have obtained*—viz., from the wilderness and Lebanon, from the river, the river Euphrates even unto the Mediterranean Sea." What a mistake for the *pseudo Moses* to make, one which all Israel would detect in a moment!

Truly when one thinks that the very words engraven on the phylacteries of Israel are from this

book—that their kings are said to have been enjoined to copy it, each one for himself ; that all the inner life of Israel was regulated by it for thousands of years, and all the feud between them and the Samaritans, of equally long standing, resulted from the provisions of this same book, *which book was, on this theory, an imposture*—truly Judaism must be set down as the religion of a nation of dupes indeed !

But what of Christianity ? And here I scarcely know how to write the conclusions to which we must arrive, for, in the first place, it is evident that our Lord considered it as the word of his Father, and consequently the guide of his steps, so that it was sufficient for Him to quote the book of Deuteronomy, with an “It is written,” to meet from the same portion of the law, the Destroyer who would have turned Him aside, and who would surely have replied, “If written at all, it was so by *my* servant the pseudo Moses.” In the next place, I find that Christ refers to the law as *the writings of Moses*, and as such the divinely sanctioned credentials of his own mission ; for He says : “Do not think that I will accuse you to the Father ; there is one that accuseth you, even Moses, in whom ye trust. For had ye believed Moses, ye would have believed Me, for *he wrote of Me*. But if ye believe not his writings how shall ye believe my words ?” This is again a reference to the book of Deuteronomy, in which is

found the promise : " A prophet shall the Lord your God raise up unto you, like unto me "—which had been treasured up in the hearts of all Israel, so that when the Jews sent priests and Levites from Jerusalem to ask John as to his mission, they further explained themselves by saying, " Art thou that Prophet?" So also the Pharisee, when he entertains Jesus, says within himself, " This Man, if He were *the Prophet* (so in Vat. MS.), would," etc. But now, if it is only THE IMPOSTOR who says, " A prophet shall the Lord your God raise up unto you, *like unto me*," what are we, then, to say of the whole credentials of our Lord? The only ground, I may say, on which such alarming conclusions rest is, that some persons think there is a difference of style between Deuteronomy and the rest of the law. It is, however, very evident that the style of this book greatly resembles that of Psalm xc. which is called " a prayer of Moses the man of God," and both works bear the impress of his fervent spirit as the shepherd of the flock of Jehovah; and, if it were otherwise, I could rest nothing upon a mere difference of style. I am sure we cannot absolutely detect by our inward intuition difference of authorship by a various mode of expression.

I would conclude my examination by saying that I consider, through the good providence of God, the most unhappy lapse of this bishop has been overruled

to great good, by bringing out more distinctly into prominence the answers to objections which might—in respect of many of them—occur to any intelligent mind; making us much better acquainted with the riches and the fulness of the Word, the glorious simplicity of that magnificent old history which we now recognize more than ever as from God, because we are more thoroughly acquainted with it, and see how beautifully the various parts are interwoven with each other and with the New Testament, just as the breastplate of the Jewish high-priest was so interwoven with the ephod, that you could not take one away without cutting the other to pieces. So you cannot cut away the Old Testament from the New without bringing Christianity into peril. I should not fear that any one who takes up the subject in a proper spirit, praying to God for guidance, will come to any other conclusion.

And let it be remembered that the necessary preliminary to the proper study of the Scriptures is to have the spirit of the sheep of Christ. Without this you simply rush into temptation. Without humility, you resemble a person going to gaze upon the sun not having a guard upon the sight—so it is blindness to attempt to gaze upon God, to criticize God in his works and ways. And this is just what, it seems to me, many of these critics have attempted. Many of these so-called wise men have thus been taken in

their own craftiness. "Every fool will be meddling," and the result is that they become so stone blind that one cannot wonder at their fall.

Such is the lesson I gather ; and I am thankful that Bishop Colenso has brought into view the whole range of this mischievous criticism—criticism which is brought into play not only in his writings, but in works which profess to pay a certain amount of deference to the Word of God. The bishop has brought neology into contempt. Let us reject the higher criticism, and clasping the blessed Word of God still more closely to our breasts, exclaim—"Thy Word is true from the beginning, and everyone of Thy righteous judgments endureth for ever."

## LECTURE V.

### THE SIX DAYS OF CREATION, AS GIVEN IN THE BOOK OF GENESIS.

THE book of Genesis, or creation—for the word “genesis” means “creation”—forms the introductory portion of the oracles of God as given to the Jewish nation, the witnesses to the unity and the glory of Jehovah. It most fitly commences with this declaration of the origin of all things, meeting the desires we naturally cherish to understand the works and purposes of God—to go back to the origin of things; and it is in this way connected with the whole book of the Pentateuch, that is, the books of Moses which we have been considering in previous lectures. It is essentially interwoven with them, and forms one book, as I have before explained. There were six days of creation, the seventh day being referred to in connection with the giving of the law and the appointment of the Sabbath as a day of special character—the *token of the covenant* (as it is called) between Jehovah and the Jewish



people, the Sabbath of rest. So that we can in no wise divide between the beginning of Genesis and the history of God's chosen people and the other parts of the Bible. It most probably embodies the earliest tradition of the chosen race, descending in the line of Shem from the days of Adam. I think we must reasonably suppose that in no period of the world's history were the people of God without a revelation of his will—a much more extensive revelation of that will than we often imagine. This might be illustrated from the history of Cain and Abel, and the manner of the sacrifices. From the very earliest periods there must have been a communication of divine knowledge to man; and the substance of this portion of the Book of Genesis, which I suppose to have been embodied by Moses in his work, must in all probability have existed before. Great stress has been laid upon this to very little purpose by many who have written on the subject, and tried on that account to overthrow the authority of Moses; but no such conclusion can be drawn from the presumption that he included in the law as sacred information those traditions that were delivered at first by inspiration to the family of man. It is interesting to me to look on this first portion of the book of Genesis as descending from the times of Adam either in tradition or by writing; but be that as it may, the glorious, heaven-taught

truth meets us at the very origin of this book, as communicated by the inspiration of God, and in no other way to be accessible to the knowledge of man, that in the beginning God created the heaven and the earth, showing us that God in his essential glory was before his creation, and distinguished from his creation, existing in his own divine essence, and forming creation for the purpose of his own glory, as we read in Revelation, "Thou<sup>h</sup>ast created all things, and for thy pleasure they are and were created." Here is a step immensely in advance of all the knowledge that man ever acquired: for up to the present day those who do not take the Bible as their guide are in twilight ignorance on these two subjects—the personal existence of God apart from his creation, and that creation as flowing from the result of his own divine will.

The word "God," which is used in the first chapter of Genesis is *Elohim*, which represents the divine being in his glorious character of power and might. We do not find the word "Jehovah" in the first chapter of Genesis. God in his sovereign power comes before us—God creating. Then we read in this chapter of the great principles of progress in the orderly arrangements or dispensations of God. And the order of creation is presented to us here as in progress from the lowest and least developed to the higher and then, the highest

point of his creation : that is to say, to man, formed in the image of God ;—all having its connection with the ultimate purpose of God in bringing out this master-piece of creation.

Hugh Miller, who was a devout believer in revelation, saw this point very clearly ; and I will bring before you, from his “ Testimony of the Rocks,” the views he cherished, though I should be inclined to carry them forward in further anticipation of what is yet to come than our author sets before us.\* He says in reference to the book of Genesis :—“ It may be safely stated that that ancient record in which man is represented as the last horn of creation is opposed by no geologic fact ; and that if, according to Chalmers, the ‘ Mosaic writings do not fix the antiquity of the globe,’ they at least *do* fix—making allowance of course for the varying estimates of the chronologer—‘ the antiquity of the human species.’ The great column of being with its base set in the sea, and inscribed like some old triumphal pillar with many a strange form—at once hieroglyphic and figure—bears, as the ornately sculptured capital, which imparts beauty and finish to the whole, reasoning, responsible man. There is surely a very wonderful harmony manifested in the proportions of that nice sequence in which the invertebrates, the fishes, the reptiles, the birds, the marsupials, the

\* See, however, Hugh Miller’s “ Schools and Schoolmasters.”

placental mammals, and, last of all, man himself, are so exquisitely arranged. It reminds us of the fine figure employed by Dryden in ~~his~~ first ode for St. Cecilia's Day—a figure which, viewed in the light cast on it by the modern science of palæontology, stands out in bolder relief than that in which it could have appeared to the poet himself:—

‘From harmony, from heavenly harmony,  
This universal frame began ;  
From harmony to harmony,  
Through all the compass of the notes it ran,  
The diapason closing full in man.’

“Morning breaks on the sixth and last day of creation. Cattle and beasts of the field graze on the plains; the thick-skinned rhinoceros wallows in the marshes, the squat hippopotamus rustles among the reeds, or plunges sullenly into the river; great herds of elephants seek their food amid the young herbage of the woods, while animals of fiercer nature—the lion, the leopard, and the bear, harbour in deep caves till the evening, or lie in wait for their prey amid tangled thickets or beneath some broken bank. At length, as the day wanes and the shadows lengthen, man, the responsible lord of creation, formed in God's own image, is introduced upon the scene, *and the work of creation ceases for ever upon the earth.* The night falls once more upon the prospect, and there dawns yet another morrow, the morrow of God's rest—that

Divine Sabbath in which there is no more creative labour." (Pp. 190, 191.)

"During this period," says Sir C. Lyell,\* *i.e.*, since the newer Pliocene period, when the fossil shells were embedded in sand near the coast, "no mammalia, not even of small species, have made their appearance, whether in Madeira and Porto Santo, or in the larger and more numerous islands of the Canarian group. *It might have been expected* from some expressions met with here and there in the 'Origin of Species.' . . . *Why did not* some of the bats, for example, after they had greatly multiplied, and were hard pressed by a scarcity of insects on the wing, betake themselves to the ground in search of prey, and gradually losing their wings become transformed into non-volant insectivora?" The answer is hidden in the Scripture account of the cessation of creative work. We do not find a single new type of species anywhere introduced, even under circumstances which might seem to call most urgently for such exertion of the Divine power. "The species perishes when the productive individuals are all destroyed; *the genus is no longer capable of generating the species, nor the family of restoring the genus.*"†

There are many more lost than living species.

\* "Antiquity of Man," p. 445.

† "Müller's Physiology," vol. i., p. 27.

Among elephants many species have disappeared. We have only one species of hippopotamus, but seven or eight fossil kinds are known. In the quarries of Montmartre alone, Cuvier has found more than forty kinds of pachydermatous species, which no longer exist. The reptiles and fishes which have ceased to live are counted by thousands; nearly forty thousand sorts of shell fish have been lost.\*

In the next place, I must consider the order and sequence of creation as shown in the first chapter of Genesis. It is represented to us as the work of six days, and the Creator rested on the seventh; but then, if we look at the seventh day, we find it different from any of the other days. "On the seventh day God ended his work which He had made; and He rested on the seventh day from all his work which He had made. And God blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it: because that in it He had rested from all his work which God created and made." (Gen. ii. 2, 3.) And then the record goes on—"These are the generations of the heavens and of the earth," without the termination of the seventh day being recorded as the terminations of all the other days are, "the evening and the morning was the fifth or sixth day," etc., or rather, "It was evening, it was morning, day one;" such are the words as they stand in Hebrew.

\* Flourens, "Ontologie."

But these are not found in regard to the seventh day. The seventh day I must therefore regard as still existing. God is still resting from the work of creation.

The early Christians found great meaning in the eighth day. It was, in fact, the day on which they rested, the resurrection day, the Lord's day as *contrasted with the Jewish Sabbath*, which they looked upon as belonging to the old Covenant. Thus Barnabas says, addressing the Jews, and referring to the words of the Lord in Isaiah, "The Sabbaths which ye now keep *are not acceptable unto me*, but those which I have made; when resting from all things *I shall begin the eighth day, that is, the beginning of the other world.*" "For which cause we (Christians) observe the eighth day with gladness, in which Jesus both rose from the dead and manifested himself to his disciples, and so ascended into heaven." Again, Justin Martyr says,\* "I can prove that God has by these means discovered to us that the eighth day *contains some greater mystery in it than the seventh.* . . . Moreover, that precept of circumcision which positively commands you to circumcise male infants on the eighth day, *was a type of that true circumcision* by which we are circumcised from sin and error through Him who rose again from the dead on the first day of the week, namely, Jesus Christ our Lord; for the

\* Dialogue with Trypho, see xxiv. and xli.

first day of the week is the first of all the days, but when all the days of the week are gone regularly round again in their course, it is called the eighth, and yet still continues to be, as it really is, the first."

There will come then, as I also believe, an eighth day—the resurrection day, of which we read in the end of the book of Revelation, when God will say, "Behold I create new heavens and a new earth" (Rev. xxi. 5). "And he that sat upon the throne said, Behold, I make all things new. And he said unto me, Write, for these words are true and faithful." And then, as the result of these, we read, "And I saw a new heaven and a new earth, for the first heaven and the first earth were passed away, and there was no more sea." Now this answers very beautifully to the eighth day; as frequently in the law you find the eighth day connected with the first day of the new series of time, and the first day of the week is also the resurrection day of the Lord. So also the eighth day of creation, if I may use the term, will be the resurrection day—the beginning of a new period, when God will make all things new—a new heavens and a new earth; everything will be renovated, and everything fully prepared for the reign of Christ and of his people; the second Adam being brought by the unfailing purposes of God into the place of pre-eminence, glory, and dignity, as the priest to bear the praises



of the whole earth, and universal family of renewed mankind to God, and to bring down blessings from God and diffuse them in a world from which sin has been expelled—the new heaven and the new earth—the glorious kingdom for which we pray when we say, “Thy kingdom come.” This kingdom will come, and will embrace all the world. “The kingdoms of the earth shall become the kingdoms of our Lord and of his Christ.” And then shall be fulfilled that which is spoken in Genesis i. 26—when God said, “Let us make man in our image, after our likeness; and let them have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over the cattle, and over all the earth, and over every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth.” This is referred to in the eighth Psalm—“Thou madest him to have dominion over the works of thy hands; thou hast put all things under his feet.” This original dominion conferred upon man, man has lost through sin, so that he is no longer in dominion as a king, but serves his own base lusts, passions, and evil propensities, and creation groans under his tyranny. If we then turn to Hebrews (chap. ii.) we read that unto the angels hath He not put into subjection the world to come—that is to say, this world *οἰκουμένη*; not heaven, but the world in a yet future dispensation, in which Christ and his people shall be the glorious

rulers of the earth. "Unto the angels hath he not put in subjection the world to come, whereof we speak. But one in a certain place testified, saying, What is man, that thou art mindful of him? or the son of man, that thou visitest him?" (Heb. ii. 5, 6). This refers to the 8th Psalm, and again to Genesis, "Thou madest him a little lower than the angels; thou crownedst him with glory and honour, and didst set him over the works of thy hands; thou hast put all things in subjection under his feet. For in that he put all in subjection under him, he left nothing that is not put under him. But now we see not yet all things put under him. But we see Jesus, who was made a little lower than the angels for the suffering of death, crowned with glory and honour." We do not see all things put under *man*, but we see Jesus crowned with glory and honour; and that is the attestation to us that he will come forth from that glory, and take the kingdom of the whole earth as his own. And then shall the eighth day be fulfilled. The whole Scriptures are linked together, and the more we study them the more distinctly we see that the great purpose of God in creation is that all the kingdom and dominion shall be given to his beloved Son, the man Christ Jesus, and to those chosen out of an evil world to be coheirs with Him of that glory. There will come then a day, called sometimes the day of

the Lord, sometimes the kingdom of Christ—one day or period, and even as I take that to be not merely a natural period of twenty-four hours but a lengthened day, so do I take all the other days spoken of in Genesis as periods represented to us in the only way I suppose in which this could be possible; the same with the evening and the morning of the first day, the second day, etc. You have the whole period spoken of in the second chapter as one day. "In the day that the Lord made the heaven and the earth" (ver. 4). This day included, of course, all the six days. In fact, this mode of speaking is very common in Scripture—speaking of a protracted period as a day. And in reference to the day of the kingdom of Christ; it is thus referred to in the Transfiguration. Our Lord says, at the end of Matt. xvi. 28, "There be some standing here which shall not taste of death till they see the Son of Man coming in his kingdom;" and then comes the scene of the Transfiguration, which was one of the days of the glory of that Son of Man; one specimen, as it were, of the future day of the kingdom, brought before the disciples on the mount. That is the only way to understand it; and a very glorious view it is; a sort of representative day of that future glory when Christ and his saints shall be together. There were the risen saints and those caught up to meet Him symbo-

lized, and all surrounded with the divine glory, and brought into the harmony of heaven. So again we read in Jeremiah iv. 23, "I beheld the earth, and, lo, it was without form, and void; and the heavens, and they had no light. I beheld, and, lo, there was no man, and all the birds of the heavens were fled. I beheld, and, lo, the fruitful place was a wilderness, and all the cities thereof were broken down at the presence of the Lord, and by his fierce anger." Here are four separate visions. The state of the land was presented before the mind's eye of the prophet. He saw first one state, and then another, and then another, and another succeeding. Now this seems to be the only way in which it is possible for us to be made acquainted with things so vastly beyond our comprehension, so immensely beyond the power of our mind to grasp, that it is for the Lord in any way he thinks proper to make them known to us. We can understand a little by the way we speak to our own children. We do not study phrases of minute accuracy; it would be the greatest folly in the world to do so. If a scientific man were to talk to his children in a way which he might himself understand, they would no more comprehend what he was saying than we could if the Lord were to give according to his own perfect knowledge of things a perfect account of the creation. It would be utterly inexplicable to

any human being—vastly beyond the compass of our faculties. So that I think we may be exceedingly thankful that the account is given to us in such a grand, comprehensive, brief, and sublime way as we have it in the first chapter of Genesis.

Many persons will still maintain that it must be as the literal record seems to speak; each day must be one of twenty-four hours. I enter on no controversy with such. They are welcome to their own view. I respect the individual who could not be shaken in his conviction that the earth was square, because the Scripture speaks of "the four corners of the earth," but I do not feel obliged to follow his opinions; and I must say that you cannot possibly get at the explanation of what Scripture means by simply taking what lies on the surface. In many instances you must dig for the meaning as for hid treasure. We have a very striking illustration of this in ground that I passed over, though I did not fully bring out the question, in the last lecture with reference to the time the Children of Israel were in Egypt. It has exercised my thoughts very much, and I have been inclined to think different ways about it. But now I have adopted the same explanation as all the soundest commentators, both Christian and Jewish. I allude to the vision of Abraham (Gen. xv. 13), where

the Lord says to Abraham, "Know of a surety that thy seed shall be a stranger in a land that is not theirs, and shall serve them; and they shall afflict them four hundred years; and also that nation, whom they shall serve, will I judge; and afterward shall they come out with great substance. And thou shalt go to thy fathers in peace; thou shalt be buried in a good old age. But in the fourth generation they shall come hither again, for the iniquity of the Amorites is not yet full." "*They shall afflict them four hundred years.*" That is very clear and definite, particularly when it is read in conjunction with Exodus xii. 40—"Now the sojourning of the children of Israel, who dwelt in Egypt, was four hundred and thirty years. And it came to pass *at the end of the four hundred and thirty years, even the self-same day* it came to pass, that all the hosts of the Lord went out from the land of Egypt." Putting these and other statements together, we find that the four hundred years of sojourning in the land of Egypt and their other afflictions began when the Lord spake to Abraham, which indeed is the only consistent way of reckoning the four generations. There were actually only two hundred and fifteen years in Egypt from the going down of Jacob and his family. A person may say, that is strange, and different from what I should have thought. And so these things are in many

cases different to what a person would think. I knew an old Christian gentleman in this neighbourhood who in his youth met with an argument of Paine's, resting on a portion of Scripture you will find in Matt. xii. 40. Our Lord says, "For as Jonas was three days and three nights in the whale's belly, so shall the Son of man be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth." Now, every one knows that our Lord was not three days and three nights in the heart of the earth, as we understand it, and that in other places it is differently represented. This gentleman was not established in the faith, and was of course very much shaken—shaken almost out of his belief in Christianity. But happily he determined that he would read over the Bible. He read it once, and was so much interested that he read it again; and he was going over it a second time when he found, in 1 Kings xii., an explanation of this apparent discrepancy, where we read that Rehoboam said to the elders of Israel (ver. 5), "Depart yet for three days, then come again to me;" and then (ver. 12), "So Jeroboam and all the people came to Rehoboam *the third day*, as the king had appointed, saying, Come to me again the third day." Accordingly this gentleman was quite satisfied with finding this in the history of Rehoboam, and he was assured he had made a mistake in supposing that the words must be

interpreted exactly as they presented themselves to him in the first instance. He afterwards became a decided believer in revelation.

Now, of course, if I said "after three days," I should mean after three whole days had elapsed, not a portion of three days; but the Jew would mean after a portion of three days had elapsed. If you made such an appointment with Englishmen, you would certainly have to wait till the three days had expired, but so did not the Jews think. It would be very unreasonable to say that every nation in the world should express their thoughts in our fashion, or we should find fault with Frenchmen for saying *huit jours* for a week and *quinze jours* for a fortnight, though I suppose they have reason for their expression as well as we have for ours. The difference lies in the Jewish mode of reckoning. They seem to reckon from the first incipient stage. Evening and morning are the first day. The day begins not from the rising of the sun, but from the preparation, the descending of the previous day: so also with the going down into Egypt. As soon as ever these events begin to take their course from the Lord's prediction, the four hundred years of affliction begin. This is what the Jews say, and I have no doubt it is the proper explanation. And our Lord reckons from the incipient commencement of the event, and so



regards the three days and three nights as any portion of the twenty-four hours.

The history of creation, then, as given in the first chapter of Genesis, must, in my opinion, be taken as the history of six different periods of creation, and viewed in this light there is in it nothing inconsistent with the discoveries of astronomy, geology, or any other science. I mention this because I know that young men sometimes get into their heads ideas that are very shallow, but which nevertheless lead them to speak very lightly of the sacred records, just because they do not understand the subject. For instance, some have said the sun was not created till the fourth day, and how then could there be light, and evening and morning on the first day. Now, it is very remarkable that the only probable hypothesis of creation—the only way in which we can suppose this wonderful work to have taken place—is the theory of Laplace, almost the most eminent astronomer that ever lived; and he makes it appear necessary that the earth should be created before the sun. According to this astronomer—second at least only to Newton, and perhaps before him in some respects as to astronomy—the whole of the planetary system was formed by the condensation of what was once the body of the sun, which has gradually contracted to its present dimensions,

throwing off the different planets—and the statement of Genesis is perfectly consistent with this theory.

In the first stage of the history of the world it must have been a molten mass, which would take an enormous time to cool, and, the water being precipitated on the surface of this heated body, of course would develop such an atmosphere, and would produce such a chaos as we find described in Genesis—“The earth was without form and void,<sup>1</sup> and darkness was upon the face of the deep.” There could not be a more accurate description than this of the state of things brought to light by the discoveries of geology—a state of things showing immense confusion on the surface, quite inconsistent with animal or vegetable life.

Then the division of the waters from the waters took place, and thus must have succeeded a balanced state of the atmosphere, which Job calls the balancing of the clouds, the wondrous works of Him who is perfect in knowledge. Then the dry land appeared, and God said, “Let the earth bring forth grass, the herb yielding seed, and the fruit-tree yielding fruit after his kind, whose seed is in itself, upon the earth: and it was so. And the earth brought forth grass, and herb yielding seed after his kind, and the tree yielding fruit, whose seed was in itself, after his kind: and God saw that it was good.” This is a beautiful description. It could

not have been otherwise, chemically speaking, than that the creation of plants must have preceded the creation of animals. The plants get their nourishment out of the materials of the earth and then form the food of animals, which are not fitted to draw their nourishment directly from the earth. Referring again to Hugh Miller, I find that a geological examination of the rocks leads to a corresponding belief (p. 134) :—

“The geologist, in his attempts to collate the divine with the geological periods, has, I repeat, only three of the six periods of creation to account for, the period of plants, the period of great sea monsters and creeping things, and the period of cattle and beasts of the earth. He is called on to question his systems and formations regarding the remains of these three great periods, and of these only, . . . . the Palæozoic or oldest fossiliferous division, the Secondary or middle fossiliferous division, and the Tertiary or latest fossiliferous division. . . . That which chiefly distinguished the palæozoic from the secondary and tertiary periods was its gorgeous flora. It was emphatically the period of plants, ‘of herbs yielding seed after their kind.’ In no other age did the world ever witness such a flora; the youth of the earth was peculiarly a green and umbrageous youth, a youth of dusk and tangled forests, of huge pines and stately araucarians, of

the reed-like calamite, the tall tree-fern, the sculptured sigillaria, and the hirsute *Epidodendron*. Wherever dry land or shallow lake or running stream appeared, from where Melville Island now spreads out its ice wastes under the star of the pole to where the arid plains of Australia lie solitary beneath the bright cross of the south, a rank and luxurious herbage cumbered every foot-breadth of the dank and steaming soil; and even to distant<sup>1</sup> planets our earth must have shone through the enveloping cloud with a green and delicate ray. Of this extraordinary age of plants we have our cheerful remembrances and witnesses in the flames that roar in our chimneys when we pile up the winter fire—in the brilliant gas that now casts its light on this great assemblage, and that lightens up the streets and lanes of this vast city—in the glowing furnaces that smelt our metals, and give moving power to our ponderous engines—in the long, dusky trains that, with shriek and snort, speed dart-like athwart our landscapes—and in the great cloud-enveloped vessels that darken the lower reaches of your noble river and rush in foam over ocean and sea. The geologic evidence is so complete as to be patent to all, that the first great period of organized being was, as described in the Mosaic record, peculiarly a period of herbs and trees ‘yielding seed after their kind.’”

At a later period, called by geologists the Secondary division, "the grand existences of the age (p. 136), the existences in which it excelled every other creation earlier or later, were its huge creeping things, its enormous monsters of the deep, and, as shown by the impressions of their footprints stamped upon the rocks, its gigantic birds. It was peculiarly the age of egg bearing animals, winged and wingless. Its wonderful whales, not, however, as now, of the mammalian, but of the reptilian class—ichthyosaurs, plesiosaurs, and cetiosaurs—must have tempested the deep." •

This is what is said in Genesis, "God created great whales," on the fifth day. The word is "dragons;" it is used in Ezekiel for dragons, and it implies creatures like crocodiles, strange forms which any one may see in the British Museum; and it is incredible how a person should have hit upon so accurate a description, if he were merely forging an account of the creation, such as you have in the Babylonian annals. Nothing can more accurately describe the monsters of this period than the word "tanninnim," or dragons.

"Its creeping lizards and crocodiles, such as the teliosaurus, megalosaurus, and iguanodon, creatures some of which more than rivalled the existing elephant in height, and greatly more than rivalled

him in bulk, must have crowded the plains or haunted by myriads the rivers of the period; and we know that the footprints of at least one of its many birds are of fully twice the size of those made by the horse or camel. We are thus prepared to demonstrate that the second period of the geologist was peculiarly and characteristically a period of whale-like reptiles of the sea, of enormous creeping reptiles of the land, and of numerous birds, some of them of gigantic size, and in meet accordance with the fact we find, that the second Mosaic period with which the geologist is called on to deal was a period in which God created the fowl that flieth above the earth with moving (or creeping) creatures, both in the waters and on the land, and what our translation renders 'great whales,' but that I find rendered in the margin, 'great sea-monsters.' "

Then comes another period, the sixth day, when the earth was nearly prepared for the introduction of man. "And God made the beast of the earth after his kind, and cattle after their kind, and everything that creepeth upon the earth after his kind: and God saw that it was good." Now, of this period Hugh Miller says:—

"Its flora seems to have been no more conspicuous than that of the present time; its reptiles occupy a very subordinate place, but its beasts of the field were by far the most wonderfully developed,

both in size and numbers, that ever appeared upon the earth. Its mammoths and its mastodons, its rhinoceri and its hippopotami, its enormous dino-therium and colossal megatherium, greatly more than equalled in bulk the hugest mammals of the present time, and vastly exceeded them in number. The remains of one of its elephants (*Elephas primigenius*) are still so abundant amid the frozen wastes of Siberia, that what have not been inappropriately termed 'ivory quarries,' have been wrought among their bones for more than a hundred years. Even in our own country, of which, as I have already shown, this elephant was for long ages a native, so abundant are the skeletons and tusks that there is scarcely a local museum in the kingdom that has not its specimen dug out of the Pleistocene deposits of the neighbourhood. And with ancient elephants there were meetly associated in Britain, as on the northern continents generally all around the globe, many other mammals of corresponding magnitude. 'Grand, indeed,' says an English naturalist, 'was the fauna of the British islands in those early days. Tigers as large again as the biggest Asiatic species lurked in the ancient thickets; elephants of nearly twice the bulk of the largest individuals that now exist in Africa or Ceylon roamed in herds; at least two species of rhinoceri forced their way through the primæval forest; and the lakes and

rivers were tenanted by hippopotami as bulky and with as great tusks as those of Africa.' ”

From one part of the coast of Suffolk tusks have been obtained representing these extinct elephants, which showed that at least five hundred must have perished there. So you may judge a little how abundant they must have been at one time in this country.

“The massive cave-bear and large cave-hyena belonged to the same formidable group, with at least two species of great oxen (*Bos longifrons* and *Bos primogenius*), with a horse of smaller size, and an elk (*Megaceros Hibernicus*) that stood ten feet four inches in height. Truly this Tertiary age—this third and last of the great geologic periods—was peculiarly the age of great beasts of the earth after their kind, and of cattle after their kind.”

‘If any one desires the evidence of all this—that there are in the stones and rocks traces of these wonderful things—they can go to the British Museum and see very good representative specimens of those of which I have spoken. Hugh Miller describes a visit to the British Museum, where, he says, speaking of these divisions, are “shapes that more than rival in strangeness the great dragons, and griffins, and ‘laithly worms’ of mediæval legend, or according to Milton, the ‘gorgons, hydras, and chimeras dire’ of classic fable,” and where are also all those



old wonderful plants that belong to the coal measure. And he says:—

“I last passed through this wondrous gallery at the time when the attraction of the Great Exhibition had filled London with curious visitors from all parts of the empire; and a group of intelligent mechanics, fresh from some manufacturing town of the Midland counties, were sauntering on through its chambers immediately before me. They stood amazed beneath the dragons of the Oolite and Lias; and, with more than the admiration and wonder of the disciples of old when contemplating the huge stones of the temple, they turned to say in almost the old words, ‘Lo, master, what manner of great beasts are these?’ ‘These are,’ I replied, ‘the sea monsters and creeping things of the second great period of organic existence.’ The reply seemed satisfactory, and we passed on together to the terminal apartments of the range appropriated to the tertiary organisms. And there, before the enormous mammals, the mechanics again stood in wonder, and turned to inquire. Anticipating the query, I said, ‘And these are the huge beasts of the earth and the cattle of the third great period of organic existence; and yonder, in the same apartment, you see, but at its farther end, is the famous fossil man of Guadaloupe, locked up by the petrificative agencies in a slab of limestone.’ The me-

chanics again seemed satisfied, and of course, had I encountered them in the first chamber<sup>9</sup> of the suite, and had they questioned me respecting the organisms with which it is occupied, I would have told them that they were the remains of the herbs and trees of the first great period of organic existence. But in the chamber of the mammals we parted, and I saw them no more."

"There could not be a simpler incident, and yet, rightly apprehended, it reads its lesson. You have all visited the scene of it, and must all have been struck by the three salient points, if I may so speak, by which that noble gallery lays strongest hold of the memory, and most powerfully impresses the imagination—by its gigantic plants of the first period (imperfectly as these are represented in the collection); by its strange misproportioned sea monsters and creeping things of the second; and by its huge mammals of the third."

When you remember that Hugh Miller was originally nothing more than a poor stone mason, working very hard for his living, but rising simply by the force of his wonderful mind to such a position, ranking so highly among all the geologists of his time, it is very pleasing to see that he was also a devout believer in revelation. He who made himself so thoroughly master of all the principles of the science, and could so well display the knowledge he

had acquired, even to the most intellectual London audience that could be gathered together—it is, I say, very pleasing to see the testimony of such a man to the truth of the Mosaic record, confirmed by the facts that appear on the observation of nature.

I do not attach too great importance to the conclusions of men of science. They are valuable, though not infallible; and they appear to me to furnish a most complete answer to those shallow sceptics who, on the ground of a little knowledge, imperfectly understood and badly put together, are ready to throw overboard the book of revelation, and with it all their hopes.

“Then all goes wrong : the old foundations rock ;  
 One scorns at him of old who gazed unshod ;  
 One striking with a pickaxe, thinks the shock  
 Shall move the mount of God.

“A little way, a very little way  
 (Life is so short), they dig into the rind ;  
 And they are very sorry—so they say—  
 . Sorry for what they find ! .

“But truth is sacred ! ay, and must be told :  
 There is a story long beloved of man ;  
 We must forego it, for it will not hold,  
 Nature had no such plan.”\*

*It has become a fashionable dogma to extend the hypothetical duration of the human race on the*

\* “Poems by Jean Ingelow,” p. 25.

earth we inhabit to a period of immense antiquity ; of thousands or hundreds of thousands of centuries ; and in connection with this, to return to heathonism for an account of his creation. The Scriptural relation is, of course, treated as a "myth," though it is admitted to be "philosophic, and sublimely simple."\* It is now believed that man derives his ancestry from the *apes* (the *Simiæ*, as we must now respectfully call them), whose peculiar qualification for giving rise to the progeny of mankind is their bestial debasement, and absence of the docility which distinguishes the elephant, of the faithfulness which characterizes the noble dog, or the industry and political sagacity which raise the bee so high in the scale of intelligence.† Man is understood to be a *gorilla*, of superior stamp, indeed, as to intelligence, though a truly detestable animal, "a mute and filthy herd," having no place in God's creation but that of destroyers and trampers down of the fair inheritance which, by some strange chance, had fallen to their lot.‡ It is supposed that, after an in-

\* Dr. Knox. "The Races of Men," p. 479. Appendix B.

† Appendix C.

‡ "How radically bad is the nature of man! for otherwise he would stand in need of no laws to restrain him. Do you think that he differs in any respect from other animals? In nothing certainly but in figure—other animals are bent, but *man is a wild beast upright in form* (ταῦτα ὀρθοὶν θηρίον)."—Philemon, B.C. circ. 360.

numerable lapse of ages, these dumb brutes began to think of acquiring the art of speech, and transforming themselves into men; that they worked together with admirable patience, though without alphabet or grammar to teach one another the meaning of the sounds they uttered, in which at length they began to discover the hidden meaning. This state of things must also have lasted through an immense lapse of ages, during which the varied tribes of articulate speaking men arose. This was the working of a law of development, of so high an order as to stand nearly in the same relation as the Deity himself to man's finite understanding, with this exception, that the Deity having first allowed man to develop as a brute, the law came in and mended matters considerably by changing him into man.\*

You will be ready to exclaim that no amount of apparent proof could succeed in establishing such conclusions; you will think that if this is to be accounted science, it should at least be confined to a college of Augurs, as at Rome (who might learn to meet without laughing in each other's faces), or to a separate caste of Druids, whose solemn aspect and peculiar dress might command respect, since to the vulgar mind such speculations will always appear devoid of sense, and what is worse, peril-

\* See, for further examination of these views, Appendix D.

ously akin to atheism. With such a conviction I entirely accord.

“A little knowledge is a dangerous thing,” and, as one of the greatest philosophers (Lord Bacon) has left on record, “a little philosophy inclineth man’s mind to atheism, but depth of philosophy bringeth it again to religion.” I believe that depth of philosophy would incline a man to religion; and that just in proportion as the Scriptures are thoroughly read and understood;—not in the light of a capricious scepticism, but as the loving communication of our heavenly Father to us his poor weak children, whose faculties can so imperfectly apprehend even the very least part of his ways—read in the spirit of a little child, men will derive benefit from them; and then, if they desire to search deeply into them and bring out their hidden meaning, they will, according to the faithful earnestness of such research have a blessing and a profit. I feel it so myself. The more I search the Scriptures the more grand, surpassing, all thought, they seem to me; and I must the more admire, and adore, and reverence the great mighty Creator of all. I would therefore close this lecture by simply commending to you all, especially any whose minds have been in doubt, or shaken by the shallow infidelity abounding in the present day, to read the Bible attentively and prayerfully. Meditate upon the blessed Word of

God, and see how it will tell its own tale. None of us can fully comprehend the depths of Scripture ; but it comes home to our hearts as true, and as proceeding from the Truth itself, in a way which nothing else does. It meets the very deepest needs of our hearts, and we may praise God that He has not left us destitute of the information without which we could not have had any true knowledge of the beginning of his marvellous works.

“ Either the WORKER did, in ancient days,  
Give us the word, his tale of love and might  
(And if in truth He gave it us, who says  
He did not give it right ?) ;

“ Or else He gave it not, and then indeed  
We know not if He is, by whom our years  
Are portioned, who the orphan moons doth lead,  
And the unfathered spheres.

“ We sit unowned upon our burial sod,  
And know not whence we come, or whese we be ;  
Comfortless mourners for the mount of God,  
The rocks of Calvary !”

J. INGELow, “ Poems,” p. 27.

## LECTURE VI.

### THE LAWS OF NATURE AND MIRACLES.

A GREAT deal is continually said in conversation, in print, in periodicals, and in works of the day, about the laws of nature. Many persons consider that these laws of nature are fixed and unchangeable, and are inconsistent with the possibility of any such occurrence as a miracle taking place; so that, in the view of many of those critics of the Scriptures, whose opinions we have been discussing in past lectures, the very mention of a miracle is sufficient to remove the narration from the page of authentic history and to show that it was not written at the time of the occurrence. The celebrated Hume, a leading sceptic of the past century, deduced from the unchangeableness of the laws of nature the impossibility, as he conceived, of miracles, and in this he has been followed by a great host of persons in Germany and in this country.

Let us, then, consider what is the meaning of the definition, and what the laws of nature



really are, in order that we may understand the subject more fully. Dugald Stewart, a master of the science of mind, says, "The order we see, not only implies *intelligence* in its first conception, but *power* by its continued existence ; or, in other words, it is the same being who *enacts* and *executes* the law." We could not anywhere find a clearer definition of the laws of nature ; and it amounts to this ; that, according to the deeply-thinking mind of Dugald Stewart, the "*laws of nature*" have no real existence whatever, and that the phrase when used is merely a decorous mode of expressing the thought that the Divine Being is continually engaged in sustaining the framework of universal being which, as Creator, He first called into existence. This is precisely my view of the question, and, if correct, it resolves itself into the statement that God, who usually acts in one uniform manner in providence, acts in another manner, when it so pleases Him, in miracles.

There can then be nothing irreconcilable in these two ideas, unless the objector is prepared either to deny the existence of God or his power to act according to his own will or choice. The laws of nature have not any reality except in our own minds and language, just as when we say the sun rises and sets, all who are acquainted with astronomy know that we use a form of speech

which is convenient, but that we really mean nothing of the kind. The sun neither rises nor does it set. We continually use the expression "nature" and "the laws of nature" in order in part to conceal our ignorance, and in part also to bridge over the immense void which exists in our knowledge betwixt the creature and the Sustainer of being as the alone Source of those forces which we see continually operating around us. In proportion as the horizon of our knowledge extends itself, do we discover the immense extent of that of which we are still ignorant. We continually tread upon the verge of the *unknown*. The very plants that twine around our hedges present problems which pass all the boundaries of science. When we come to speak of voluntary motion, of selection, of what in animals would be called instinct, and extraordinary sensibility to impressions in mere *plants*, amounting to their recoiling with disgust from some objects and attaching themselves to others, and even more of capacities and of latent or transmissible *tendencies* in the vegetable creation, it is obvious that we are incapable of explaining *how* these things can be, and that we cannot even conceive of the mode in which these results are brought about.\*

This truth may be illustrated from the micro-

\* See Appendix E.

scopic observation of the formation of a simple vegetable cell, that is to say, of that which is sometimes looked upon as primordial, and as the origin of all things. But the cell itself has an origin, for, to say nothing of the cytoblast, or other mysteries contained in it, it is a *cell* by virtue of the walls enclosing it, without which it would not be a *cell*. That which precedes these walls are *currents* in the liquid mass out of which the cell is formed—these currents being occasioned by some agency more recondite than the liquid itself. So we gradually recede from the solid to the liquid, from the liquid to the intangible and the invisible, as we approach *nearer* to the great secret and source of existence. For as in the *microcosm* man, so in the *macrocosm* the universe, that which is most inward and hidden is nevertheless most essentially the life and spirit, animating the whole, and the outward manifestation of the invisible far transcends all that the material form can, of itself, produce to sight, as is evident in every instance in which the “Formative Power”\* (whatever that may be) clothes itself in a new structure of animated existence. Wonderfully is this illustrated in the unfolding of the *animal-plant*,† with its floating flower-buds, and all the complicated structure which it builds up with such inimitable skill and beauty by repeated buddings from a single

\* See Appendix F.

† See Appendix G.

germ. Who can deny that here as everywhere the *Unseen* and the *Unknown* is really the Painter and Architect as well as the Poet of the delightful story which is enacted before our sight. How can mere impenetrable atoms, hard insensible matter, act with such skill, unless guided by a higher *Force*?

The Scriptures both of the Old and New Testament assert that God is the blessed and only Potentate. The elders cast their crowns before the throne, saying, "Thou art worthy, O Lord, to receive honour and power" (Rev. iv. 10, 11), "for Thou hast created all things, and for thy pleasure they are and were created." This takes up the very echoes of David's lyre, when he says, "Blessed be Thou, Lord God of Israel, our Father, for ever and ever. Thine, O Lord, is the greatness and the power, and the glory, and the victory, and the majesty, for all that is in the heaven and in the earth is thine" (1 Chron. xxix. 11). And again, even more strikingly the prophet Isaiah says, in the fortieth chapter, "Who hath measured the waters in the hollow of his hand, and meted out heaven with a span, and comprehended the dust of the earth in a measure, and weighed the mountains in scales, and the hills in a balance?" Beautifully true is this in every possible way we can conceive of it; the mountains, and hills, and dust of the earth, the

waters, and everything else, meted out in weight, measure, and order, according to the infinite skill of the great Architect. "Who hath directed the Spirit of the Lord, or being his counsellor, hath taught Him? With whom took He counsel, and who instructed Him and taught Him knowledge, and showed to Him the way of understanding? Behold the nations are as a drop of a bucket, and are counted as the small dust of the balance; behold He taketh up the isles as a very little thing. All nations before Him are as nothing; and they are counted to Him less than nothing and vanity. To whom, then, will ye liken me, or shall I be equal? saith the Holy One. . . . Lift up your eyes on high, and behold who hath created these things that bringeth out their host by number; He calleth them all by names, by the greatness of his might, for that He is strong in power; not one faileth." Not one of those orbs that we behold on a starry night, not one faileth, because of his upholding power. He is Jehovah Sabaoth, the Lord of all the hosts of heaven and of all powers on earth. And Paul, in preaching to the Athenians, says (Acts xvii. 24), "God that made the world and all things therein, seeing that He is Lord of heaven and earth, dwelleth not in temples made with hands; neither is worshipped with men's hands, as though He needed anything, seeing He

giveth to all life, and breath, and all things ; and hath made of one blood all nations<sup>o</sup> of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth, and hath determined the times before appointed, and the bounds of their habitation ; that they should seek the Lord, if haply they might feel after Him, and find Him, though He be not far from every one of us ; for in Him we live, and move, and have our being ; as certain also of your own poets have said, For we are also his offspring.” This brings the truth of the being and existence of God very closely home to us. Christ is thus represented in the first chapter of the Hebrews, as “upholding all things by the word of his power. • When He had by Himself purged our sins, He sat down at the right hand of the Majesty on high.” You will see that this view of the continual upholding presence of God in every part and portion of the creation that He has established, goes a great deal beyond the conception of most persons ; but you will be prepared now to enter into some of the testimonies of really scientific men, before we look at any of the false ideas that are prevalent. In the first place, I would read to you the creed of Sir Isaac Newton, as contained in the “Gentleman’s Magazine” for 1731, which is very striking as coinciding so well with the grand and glorious truths we have read from the Scriptures.

“This Being (that is God) governs all things, not as a soul<sup>e</sup> of the world, but as Lord of the universe ; and upon account of his dominion He is styled Lord God,<sup>t</sup> supreme over all. The supreme God is an eternal, infinite, absolutely perfect Being ; but a being, how perfect soever, without dominion, is not Lord God. The term God very frequently signifies Lord, but every lord is not God. The dominion of a spiritual being constitutes Him God : true dominion, true God ; imaginary dominion, imaginary God. He is not eternity and infinity, but eternal and infinite. He is not duration and space, but has duration of<sup>e</sup> existence, and is present ; by existing always and every<sup>w</sup>where, He constitutes duration and space, eternity and infinity. Since every part of space, and every indivisible moment of duration is everywhere, certainly the Maker and Lord of all things cannot be said to be in no time and no place. He is omnipotent, not by his power only, but in his very substance ; for power cannot subsist without substance. God is not at all affected by the motions of bodies, neither do they find any resistance from the omnipresence of God. He necessarily exists, and by the same necessity He exists always and everywhere. Whence, also, it follows that He is all similar, all eye, all ear, all brain, all arm, all sensation, all understanding, all active power ; but this not in a human or corporeal,

but in a manner wholly unknown to us, therefore not to be worshipped under any corporeal representation."

This is all comprehended in the glorious declaration, God is Spirit—Πνέυμα ὁ Θεός;\* so, that He is really the alone self-existing Power, as He is the alone pure Spirit in the universe. You see how near this brings his existence to us, and shows that all creation simply exists and is upheld by the power of his hand; so that He has but to act in a way that He has not usually done, and all creation would dissolve as a scroll. All things continue to exist by the continued power of God acting everywhere. It is this truth that Sir Isaac Newton expounds in the above creed which has been repeated in different forms, and has attracted very much the attention of thinking men.

The next thing I would refer to is the remarkable and interesting thought of one of the most deep and powerful minds of the present day—Mr. Grove, F.R.S.—who concludes a scientific work of the most profound research, "On the Correlation of Physical Forces," in the following words, "In all phenomena the more closely they are investigated, the more are we convinced that, humanly speaking, *neither matter nor force can be created or annihilated*, and that an essential cause is

\* John iv. 24.



unattainable. CAUSATION IS THE WILL: CREATION IS THE ACT OF GOD."

The Rev. Mr. Birks, who has written, in my opinion, the very deepest book that has been published in this century on the constitution of matter,\* says concerning the objections to revelation which he combats, "The combined momentum of so many false reasonings, arithmetical, critical, geographical, and historical, is not slight, when they impinge on ill-informed or self-conceited minds, whom every wind of false doctrine readily sweeps away. But they are light as dust in the balance compared with one sentence from the lips of the Son of God, who has written the truth deep in the heart of all his true disciples, who bow with reverence to his Divine authority, 'It is easier for heaven and earth to pass, than for one jot or tittle of the law to fail.'"<sup>†</sup>

I must now turn to the perverted views of the subject, exemplified in the works of some modern writers, which have unhappily had great effect upon the minds of many, so that, no doubt, as the "Journal of Science" well remarks, "A substratum of atheism and absolute de-negation of God is forming somewhat rapidly under the surface in intellectual society." No doubt many thinking men in the present day are atheists. There is no use in denying this. It is all the more unhappy for them,

\* "Matter and Ether."      † "Exodus of Israel," Preface.

but we must in all charity seek, as far as we may, to remove the difficulties of such.

Paley, another of our great writers, says "There is a mistake concerning the idea which the term law expresses in physics, *wherever such an idea is made to take the place of power, and still more of an intelligent power, and as such to be assigned for the cause of anything, or of any property of anything that exists. . . .* A law pre-supposes an agent, for it is only the mode according to which an agent proceeds; it implies a power, for it is the order according to which that power acts. *Without this agent, this power, which are both distinct from itself, the LAW does nothing, is nothing.*" Of course not, but then we are so apt to be led astray by the words that we use, that the term nature, for instance, being at first used as a veil for ignorance, comes to stand in many minds for a being, and NATURE is supposed to do certain things; and this is just the way heathenism arose. Thus in the most ancient Veda, preserving the opinions of the Sanscrit-speaking people probably more than 1000 years B.C., the Great Unknown is spoken of as THAT, but the objects of real worship are the powers of nature, fire, and the winds, and the like.

In the "Vestiges of the Natural History of Creation"—a work which went through many editions, and has influenced more or less many minds—we have

an illustration of the tendency of the mind to deify the powers of nature. The author has chosen to avail himself of the anonymous style of publication, thus shunning a manly avowal of his views: he says, in his concluding note to the eighth edition,\* that “the whole point contended for all along has been that the Deity creates and governs in the manner of law, as distinguished from any imaginable, arbitrary, and uncertain mode. His constant presence in the operations of nature has been always upheld. It has appeared to the author himself that these views are not incompatible with religious feeling.” I quote this in order to do him justice, and to show that it was not, at least at that period, his intention to give up the idea of a Supreme Being. But if I look into the work I find the author entangled in conceptions which strongly gravitate towards heathenism—the heathenism I have been describing as the deification of the laws of nature. Starting with a recapitulation of the proofs of wondrous skill disclosed by modern science in creation, showing that God has made all things in number, weight, and measure, he says:†—“As a set of laws produced all orbs, their motions and geognostic arrangements, so a set of laws may be supposed to have overspread them all with life. The whole

\* “Vestiges of Creation,” p. 289.

† Ibid., second edition.

productive or creative arrangements would thus appear in unity." Now what is the meaning of this? It appears to him "that *fiats* for the production of particular species out of inorganic elements is the idea of a clown" (p. 290). So that when we find in Genesis that God formed man out of the dust of the ground, this is the idea of a clown; or of Moses, whom he looks upon, perhaps, much in the same light. "The clown," he says, "views all phenomena as arbitrary results of divine power." "Fiats for the production of particular species out of inorganic elements" is a theory, according to him, which "can never become science." So that when God said "Let there be light, and light was," the sentence that created the admiration of the heathen critic Longinus as most sublime, this essayist sees nothing in it but the idea of a clown; and the formation of species by particular acts of divine power he considers to be very derogatory to the idea of a God—in fact, giving Him too much trouble. The Epicureans thought it *unworthy* of the Deity to do everything Himself (*αὐτοῦργον ἅπαντα*).\*

In order to save the Almighty the trouble of

\* In like manner Buffon "se moque de Reaumur, qui veut trouver l'Être Suprême attentif à conduire une république de mouches, et fort occupé de la manière dont se doit plier l'aile d'un scarabée."—*Flourens*, "*De l'Instinct et de l'Intelligence*," p. 34.

creation, he has arranged a system of progressive development, which, indeed, is not his elaboration, but that of the celebrated Lamarck, by which everything may be developed out of nothing, or at least out of some aboriginal sea-weed which grew in the ocean in very early days, and which seems to have been the origin of everything. He thinks that germinal vesicles were first formed in this sort of sea, which was the original matrix out of which everything was formed; and he says (p. 128):—"Remembering these things, it seems, after all, an obvious idea that a chemico-electric operation, by which germinal vesicles were produced, was the first phenomena\* in organic creation, and that the second was an advance of these through a succession of higher grades, and a variety of modifications, in accordance with laws of the same absolute nature as those by which the Almighty rules the physical department of nature. . . . We have to convince ourselves both that a fish may advance to be a reptile, and a reptile to be a bird," etc.

In millions of years these vesicles changed in the bosom of the sea into slugs and other small creatures. These became fishes; these reptiles; the reptiles became whales; and the whales, laying their heads on the shore, wished very much to tread the land, and therefore they produced pro-

\* Sic.

geny which became by degrees bears.\* And then from these whales—that is from the *Manatean* section of the *cetaceæ*—strange to say, at last man came to have his being, bats, lemurs, and monkeys figuring among his ancestry; and still further back having croaked with his brother frogs in the eocene marshes (1851 ed., p. 279). Still further, he says—“In these things the superficial thinker will see only matter for ridicule;” but why should any one laugh?—for (he adds) “The frog is the only animal besides man that has a calf to his leg.” A very conclusive argument, certainly, to show that we are allied to the frogs! The monkeys are to be regarded as more immediate predecessors of the human genus, but the sloth seems to stand on nearly the same footing, and, on the whole, man appears to be an improved kind of seal, and the mermaids to be truly his maternal ancestry. Any one who knows this celebrated book, must admit that this is its theory, though a little veiled in the second edition. The author evidently thinks it not improbable that the whole race of spiders, or these with the insects also, might have sprung almost or wholly at once from inorganic elements *under the proper electric influences*. He takes great pains to explain how this might be; so that here (instead of what he ridicules as the idea of a clown)

\* See further, Appendix H.

we have ELECTRICITY exalted to be in fact the divine CREATOR ; for if infinite design, intelligence, wisdom, goodness, and power be held to prove a divine creation, surely the tribes of insects and *arachnidæ* thus sprung from electricity would furnish evidence to prove the fact. So that these speculations are, indeed, scarcely one step removed from heathenism, and the person who accepts these ought consistently to believe that when he strokes his cat the wrong way, he educes his God, and he might fall down and worship the spark thus eliminated. How far this is removed from the old Persian worship of fire as the symbol of the invisible and unseen light—that is of God—it would be hard to say. I think that the early Persian idolaters, or the modern (for the Parsees still worship fire), are far more simply consistent in their ideas than this English theorist.

The religion of this author is on a par with his philosophy—absolute fatalism. Such as man is, with an overpowering preponderance often of vicious influences, because of the configuration of his brain, such is the destiny which he must work out ; and if calamity overtakes him he must remember that it is but the inexorable law of nature that crushes him. Prayer is of no use for the miserable, for of what use is it to pray to a law of nature which must blindly fulfil its course. He illustrates some of these

sentiments by an accident which happened to some Irish emigrants who, on taking leave of their friends, clung to each other so that they upset the vessel and many were drowned. He says this cannot be supposed to be the act of man nor of God, and, in fact, it must be the inevitable result of the laws of nature.

Such are the speculations which occupy the minds of some of the teachers of the people.

Further in advance, but in the same line of things, and capable of indicating to some persons rocks ahead in their course, is a very recent work which has made considerable stir both on the Continent and in England. The English translation is called "Force and Matter," being a translation by J. F. Collingwood, F.R.S., F.G.S., etc., of the last edition of "Kraft und Stoff," by Dr. L. Buchner, President of the Medical Association of Hesse Darmstadt. Neither of these, therefore, are unobscured persons, possessing no influence, but they are men holding high positions. This, if I may judge by the reviews of the work in the "Journal of Science," is a theory of perfect atheism, proceeding on the assumption that matter and force are both immortal.\* "The forces are inherent in matter. The idea of an external, personal activity," or God, "is excluded by the many irregularities, contingencies, etc., in the economy of

\* Appendix I.



the universe and individual bodies," for some obscure individual, who wrote in 1860 "The History and Laws of Creation," says that if he—Hudson Tuttle—had only been consulted, things would have been made much better than they now are. No doubt he thinks so, and he is not the only one who may privately be of that opinion as regards themselves; though it does not seem to be a conclusive argument to others. This author appears most conscientiously to reject all morality. Man's will is dependent on a fixed necessity, and science has no concern with morals. The remedy for all evil is suicide. A person inclines to conscientiousness; he is just in all his transactions, and may put a term to his existence if deprived of the possibility of fulfilling his obligations. Such is the morality of those who begin by denying the Scriptures, and extinguish the only "lamp unto the feet" of man in this dark world. And is it not melancholy to perceive, in the midst of gospel light, an undercurrent drifting away the minds of multitudes, both on the Continent and in this country, towards such rocks and shoals as these, to the utter abandonment of all morality. For when men have overthrown Judaism and Christianity, what is their morality but a mere idiosyncrasy of the mind? One man may think one thing to be immoral; another, another thing. There would be no standard of right and wrong under such a system,

and every one might do that which was good in his own sight.\*

Now certainly, painful as this is, it illustrates the position in which we all are naturally—that is, having not the knowledge of God. “When the world by wisdom knew not God,” the Apostle Paul says, “it pleased God by the foolishness of preaching to save those that believe;” not by the preaching of foolishness, but by the foolishness of preaching. God makes himself known in that particular way. He does not choose to be approached by human reason, scanning what it can behold of the outskirts of the robe of his majesty. God will not be looked at, and here we see evidence of it; but He reveals Himself, and this in the way which He Himself chooses.

In order that He might make Himself known in the days of old in connection with the progeny of the seed of Abraham his friend, He covenanted to work miracles such as shall be manifest to all the world as the works of almighty power. He said (Exodus xxxiv. 10) “Behold, I make a covenant; before all thy people I will do marvels, such as have not been done in all the earth, nor in any nation: and all the people among which thou art shall see the work of the Lord; for it is a terrible thing that I will do with thee.” This, I apprehend,

\* “Οὐκ ἐστ’ ἀνοίας οὐδὲν τολμηρώτερον.”—*MENANDER*.

“There is nothing more daring than ignorance.”

is connected with what we considered in a recent lecture—the revelation of the name Jehovah; that when the self-existing I AM, the infinite and eternal Being, would show that He was on the side of the people whom He favoured, He revealed Himself as the One who could touch all the springs of matter, and change all the laws of nature at his pleasure, as easily as I may move my hand in one direction or another. We do not find that God wrought miracles in the same way in the lives of Abram, Isaac, and Jacob. He was their God, but He had not covenanted then to work miracles according to the revelation of his name, Jehovah. Now by these miracles He said that He was determined to reveal his name in all the earth.\* In the first place, in the destruction of Pharaoh—"For this very purpose," He says, "I have raised thee up that by thee *my name might be made known to all*

\* See this acknowledged by Rahab—"I know, that Jehovah hath given you the land, and that your sorrow is fallen upon us, and that all the inhabitants of the land faint because of you: for we have heard how Jehovah dried up the water of the Red Sea for you when ye came out of Egypt. . . . And as soon as we had heard these things, our hearts did melt, neither did there remain any more courage in any man because of you; *for Jehovah your God He is God in heaven above and in the earth beneath.*"

Also by the Philistines—"Woe unto us! who shall deliver us out of the hands of these mighty Gods? These are the Gods that smote the Egyptians with all the plagues in the wilderness."—1 Sam. iv. 8.

By Cyrus—"Thus saith Cyrus, King of Persia: Jehovah God

*the earth.*" In the next place, in the signs and wonders in Egypt—"Which hast set signs and wonders in the land of Egypt, . . . and hast made thee a name, as it is this day" (JER. xxxii. 20). Then in dividing the Red Sea—"Dividing the waters before them, to make Himself an everlasting name" (Is. lxiii. 12); also in drying up the waters of the Jordan, "that all the people of the earth might know the hand of Jehovah, that it 'is mighty, that ye might fear Jehovah your God for ever;" and next in driving out the Canaanites, the seven nations greater and mightier than the Israelites—"To make thee a name of greatness and terrible-ness" (1 Chron. xvi. 21). Then in executing vengeance on the enemies of Israel—"That men may know that thou, whose name alone is Jehovah, art the most high over all the earth (Psalm lxxxiii. 18; 2 Chron. xxi.); and further, in their restoration from the first captivity, and the manner of their future re-ingathering (Jeremiah xvi. 14, 15)—"Therefore, behold, the days come, saith the Lord, that it

of heaven hath given me all the kingdoms of earth, and He hath charged me to build him an house at Jerusalem, which is in Judah . . . to build the house of the *Lord God of Israel* (HE IS THE GOD) which is in Jerusalem."

Indeed, it may be said that to the present hour the remembrance of these mighty works is fresh in the minds of the natives of those lands, and indelibly recorded in the names of the scenes of the events.

shall no more be said, Jehovah liveth, that brought up the children<sup>1</sup> of Israël out of the land of Egypt; but Jehovah liveth, that brought up the children of Israel from the land of the north, and from all the lands whither He had driven them; and I will bring them again into their land that I gave unto their fathers.” That is to say—and the statement is confirmed in other passages, that He will do wonders again; that the day will come when the Lord will again work miracles, but He will work them only in connection with Israel, because it is only in connection with the nation of Israel that He is determined to make his<sup>e</sup> name known in all the earth. For they are the standing witness, and I may say, the intolerable annoyance of the sceptic even now. Their outcast condition and desolate state, as exiles driven from their country, and yet upheld by the power of God, who has promised “yet will I be to them as a little sanctuary in the countries where they shall come” (Ezekiel xi. 16)—this, their very state, is the fulfilment of prophecy.\* But when the Lord shall gather them to the land of possession,

\* For “the stranger that shall come from a far land. . . . even all nations shall say, Wherefore hath Jehovah done thus unto this land? what meaneth the heat of this great anger? Then men shall say, Because they have forsaken the covenant of Jehovah God of their fathers, which He made with them when He brought them forth out of the land of Egypt: for they went and served other gods, and worshipped them, gods whom they knew not, and

He has promised to work miracles in their behalf, which He will never do for any other nation.

The miracles of our blessed Saviour were the demonstrations of his divine mission—the work which his Father gave Him to do. They were the evidence of his power—that He could recall the dead to life, that He could touch the springs of disease, that He could recall to health, that He could make the lame man leap as a hart, cause the dumb to sing, and fulfil all that was written in the ancient books concerning him who was to be the Messiah, the sent of God, the Shiloh, the Christ, and who was to gather the nation back to God, and in whom the Gentiles were to trust. All these things were wrought openly, publicly, and manifestly, so that the Jews, much as they were disposed to cavil, doubt, and in every way reject Him, never dare to say that He did not work miracles. And then the grand miracle, after all, to which the attention of all mankind was called in connection with our Lord is his resurrection from the dead (Acts xvii. 31). “Because He hath appointed a day in the which He will judge the world in righteousness, by that man

whom He had not given unto them. And the anger of Jehovah was kindled against this land, to bring upon it all the curses that are written in this book: and Jehovah rooted them out of their land in anger, and in wrath, and in great indignation, and cast them into another land, as it is this day.”—DEUT. 22—28.

whom He hath ordained, whereof He hath given assurance unto<sup>4</sup> all men, in that He hath raised Him from the dead." All men are called to come and look at that great fact that never can be disputed, the resurrection of our Lord from the dead.

It is very remarkable how in that connection all the manifold assaults made by sceptics in every possible way upon the truth of God's Word, the Scriptures, not only fail to shake the historical basis of our faith, but add so much stronger testimony to it. The battle-ground seems to be very much narrowed, and a great deal of that which is most important for Christians to hold as regards the external bulwarks of faith is acknowledged on every hand. Even M. Renan does not at all deny the general account given in the gospels of our blessed Lord, though with the audacity peculiar to himself he gives his own explanations. For example, he makes our Lord an assenting party, in connection with Lazarus, to enacting a sort of tragic farce. Lazarus, he says, having been sick and pale, clothed himself in grave clothes and put himself in a tomb. Our Lord thought it necessary to do something to strike the Jews with amazement, and so He said, Lazarus come forth, and Lazarus came forth, looking sick, and with all these grave clothes about him. But still, Renan does not deny the fact; he does not even deny the appear-

ance of a miracle. In all these things we have to congratulate ourselves that the foundation of God standeth sure, and that the historical evidence comes out so clear from all the surging waves of assault raised against it.

Further and for the rest, it appears to me that the miracles of the present dispensation were confined to the early days of it so far as regards the manifestation of divine power on behalf of the Church, and they seem to have been the attestation of the favour of God passing over from the Jewish body, from the old nation which corporately enjoyed the favour of the Lord, to the new body, that is, the Church. These miraculous gifts and dispensations were very important in the early days of Christianity, but by degrees they faded away; so that, in the days of Augustine, about 400 A.D., they could not point to any further evidence of miraculous power than is now possible, only that in connection with believing prayer God is pleased to act in a way He would not otherwise have acted. Of this Augustine gives a striking instance. The great feature of the present dispensation is its spiritual character, that is, the reality of divine grace in the heart, which is not adapted to strike wonder into the minds of all nations. Wherever Christians are they are to be like the candle set on a candlestick, like a city set on a hill, that men may



see their good works and glorify their Father in heaven. But there is nothing miraculous in this in the sense in which the miracles in Egypt struck all beholders, so that even the Egyptian magicians said, "This is the finger of God." And yet, wherever a soul is turned from darkness to light there is a direct interruption of the laws of nature, because, according to these laws, the evil principles in man are too strong for him. But let divine grace operate; let there be repentance towards God and faith in our Lord Jesus Christ, and there is a new creation, and that is an interruption of the laws of nature. It is, in real truth, a miracle in that sense, but not in the sense in which I should like to use the word, because it would be misunderstood; but it is, nevertheless, "the arm of Jehovah," *God acting* in such a way as to rescue the soul by the mighty power of grace from going down to perdition; and that is an interruption of the natural course of unconverted man. So that although we do not expect to see such outward manifestations of divine power as to strike all around with astonishment, we do expect and ought to expect that when we approach God with earnest, humble, believing hearts in prayer, God will really act, and bless, and do things for us that He otherwise would not do; that, in fact, we are not abandoned to the laws of nature, as the author of "Vestiges" seems to imply, laws which seem

sometimes to cross each other, so that we do not know what shall happen next. The Christian has a Father in heaven who bows down his ear to him. "The eyes of the Lord are upon the righteous; his ear is open to their cry." The Christian has a Friend above. The living God who is the Saviour of all men, specially of those who believe, is a personal God; not a dead, sleeping, or inert nothing-at-all,\* such as the heathens imagined—such as can do nothing—cannot help their followers, and, therefore, might well be represented as idols that had eyes, and ears, and hands, but must needs be borne, because they could not go.

"Most educated men have for some time been aware of the presence, in our contemporary literature, of a certain pantheistic element, which perhaps they have felt rather than have been able to analyze. Twenty years ago a learned and pious divine of the Church of England wrote these warning words,— 'We hear much of laudable efforts to bring the saving truths of Christianity within the reach of the votaries of Brahminism, but few amongst us are aware that the very esoteric doctrine of Brahminism, and of all pagan theology, is now in the course of propagation in cultivated minds from the

\* "An *infinite nihility* like Brahmin."—"Hardy's Buddhism," p. 41.

centre of Christian Europe.' This warning has been fulfilled. The snow has melted in Germany, and we have had a flood in England."\*

†

\* "Modern Pantheism," vol. ii. p. 193.

---

Longinus de Subl. ix. circ. A.D. 250.—"In the same way the Jewish lawgiver, a man of no ordinary genius, when he had conceived in his mind a just idea of the grandeur of the Supreme Being (*ἐπειδὴ τὴν τοῦ θεοῦ δύναμιν κατὰ τὴν ἀξίαν ἐχώρησε*), has given expression to it in noble language in the beginning of his work containing his laws.—'And God said'—what? 'Let there be light, and there was light. Let the earth be, and the earth was.'"

## LECTURE VII.

### MYSTICISM AS OPPOSED TO THE REVELATION OF GOD IN SCRIPTURE.

NOTHING can be more clear in Scripture than the distinct announcement of the personality of the Divine Being—of his essential existence as incapable of being compared with that of any of his creatures. “I Am that I Am,” was the revelation of Himself to Moses, showing that He is known only to Himself, and, as spoken of by man, He was to be called Jehovah, or according to the more probable pronunciation of the word, Jah or Jahveh—the One that is eternal, the One that ever shall be. We are to speak of Him in the term which He gives to us; He can speak of Himself in the term known only to Himself. He is the Creator of all things; for his pleasure they are and were created. He is consequently distinct from the creature though capable of holding communion with or acting upon the creature. The great declaration of the glory of God as regards the point we are

speaking of, his essential essence, is found in John iv., and that from the lips of the beloved 'Son of God, who came forth from his bosom as the brightness of the Father's glory, and the express image of his person, to reveal Him unto men (ver. 24)—"GOD IS SPIRIT"—*πνευμα ὁ θεος*. He alone can possess this attribute. We cannot comprehend his essence. Man is a creature. "Jehovah Elohim, formed man of the dust of the ground and breathed into his nostrils the breath of lives;\* and man became a living soul." There is in man the natural and the spiritual† life—the merely earthly life and that which is more connected, as we shall see presently, with heavenly things. This *status* he shares (as regards his being a living soul), with the beasts of the earth, as we read in Gen. i. 30. All the beasts of the earth are described as having a living soul in them. In all these things it is well to keep to Scriptural expressions, and you may notice, as we go along, how often these Scriptural terms do not coincide exactly with the Platonist notions that have been more often adopted in writing and in speaking. Gen. i. 30, "And to every beast of the earth, and to every fowl of the air, and to everything that creepeth upon the earth, wherein there is life,† I have given every green

\* It is so expressed in the original (*chayim*).

† In the margin it is, and rightly, "a living soul."

herb for meat: and it was so." This is one of the instances in which the expressions<sup>1</sup> in Scripture point to a far more clear and accurate knowledge of the state of things than much of the philosophy of the present day. The living soul is connected with the blood in the Book of Leviticus—the life and the blood. But over and above this we read that man possesses a spirit (*πνευμα*, see Luke viii. 55), which is his peculiar prerogative above the beasts of the field.

Man, then, while he shares the living soul with the beasts of the earth, has, in addition to this, "spirit." He is, according to Scripture, body, soul, and spirit: a threefold constitution;\* and whilst all animals look to him as lord of this lower world, he alone is fitted for communion with his Maker. Animals reason according to their measure, and think up to a certain point, as any one may notice. In the dog, for instance, there is something beyond instinct; there is a capability of improvement which there is not in what we call the operations of instinct.<sup>†</sup> It is not, then, only in the capacity of thought that man differs from the lower animals, but in his higher nature, his spiritual nature; for *he alone worships God*. This is the distinctive peculiarity of man;† not the shape of his foot or

\* 1 Thess. v. 23.

† "*σάρκία ἐστὶ καὶ πνευματικόν, καὶ τὸ ἡγεμονικόν.*"—*MARCUS ANTONINUS*.

the convolutions of his brain. He is formed in the image of God, a priest unto God, capable of bearing the praises due from creation to the Creator, capable of himself receiving the knowledge of God. He is nevertheless a limited and not an illimitable being. He is a creature of earth; and all that he is and has he owes to the will and power of the Almighty. If he looks for immortality, it is not as the essential prerogative of his nature, but as the promise of God, who ONLY hath immortality, alone possesses, as we read in Scripture, that glorious attribute. You find this declaration in 1 Tim. vi., where the apostle Paul, speaking of the appearing of our Lord Jesus Christ, goes on (v. 15) to say: "Which in his times he shall show, who is the blessed and only Potentate, the King of kings, and Lord of lords; who only hath immortality, dwelling in the light which no man can approach unto; whom no man hath seen, nor can see: to whom be honour and power everlasting." A most glorious description, this, of the attributes of God. God cannot be beheld by the human eye. No man can see God in his essence. It follows that a revelation of God, as, for instance, that to the elders of Israel, must have been in the person of the Son, before He became incarnate, revealing Himself thus, even before He condescended in his infinite grace and mercy to be made flesh and to dwell among us.

When that great and wondrous incarnation of the Son of God took place, then the real meaning of creation, as illustrating the glory of God, was in measure revealed; though it awaits the full glorious consummation, when all things shall be made subject unto God, and when, in the person of the Son, all things shall find their head\* in the God-man; creation shall then be united to God by an indissoluble bond.

Mysticism in all its shapes is virtually a denial of this revelation of God in Scripture. It proceeds upon the assumption of the creation being a part of God, and there being no distinction between the creature and the Creator. In the systems of heathenism there is not to be found any clear recognition of the distinction between God and the creature. Nor was it ever a fixed point of belief with the heathen that the world had any beginning at all, or was in any sense created. The verse of the Roman poet expresses something like their general opinion:—

*“Quid est Deus, nisi terra, et pontus, et aer  
Jupiter est quodcunque vides, ubicunque moveris.”*

*“What is God, except earth, and sea, and air!  
Jove is whatever thou seest, wherever thou movest.”*

The loftiest mountains were mountains of God; the high cedars, cedars of God (or, as we have it

\* Eph. i. 10.



in Sanscrit, Deodara, the native name for those magnificent trees). The thunder was the voice of God; and the ocean reflected his image; as Byron expresses it:—

“Where the Almighty’s Form glasses itself in tempests.”

Everything grand, or unknown, or stupendous in nature, could claim the worship of the heathen, especially the sun, moon, and stars, as influencing the destinies of mankind. Even to this generation the Irish peasant in Achill has been accustomed to swear by Slievemore, the highest mountain in that island.

Idolatry thus becomes a very easy thing, and any great man may plausibly claim for himself divine honour, as having more of God in him than another. Pope has expressed the above ideas in his usual fluent verse :

“All are but parts of one stupendous whole,  
Whose body nature is, and God the soul  
That changed thro’ all, and yet in all the same.  
Great in the earth, as in the ethereal frame,  
Warms in the sun, refreshes in the breeze,  
Glowes in the stars, and blossoms in the trees;  
Lives thro’ all life, extends thro’ all extent,  
Spreads undivided, operates unspent,  
Breathes in our soul, informs our mortal part,  
As full, as perfect, in a hair as heart;  
As full, as perfect, in vile man that mourns,  
As the rapt seraph that adores and burns.  
To Him no high, no low, no great, no small,  
He fills, He bounds, connects, and equals all.”

It is not surprising to find modern science tending strongly in this direction, seeing that in proportion as we press forwards, we get beyond the boundaries of mere materialism in its gross sense, and advance into the unknown regions that lie beyond the precincts of tangible matter. This is not only familiar to every one well versed in science in the present day, but even manifest to all, since we send a message to a great distance by the electric telegraph, in less time than it would take a person of slow conception of thought to form the idea in the brain. We see, then, that we have, by some means, advanced beyond the mere material—that which we generally call matter, in its more obvious aspects. I do not mean to say that there is anything “spiritual” in electricity, for instance—very far from it. I merely look upon it as having to do with a more refined creation, something which more easily escapes our senses. Mere materialism is now quite left behind by modern discoveries.\* Science requires something more, and not willing to recognize the Creator in all things, men of science, investigating his works, often attribute to nature that which can only be attributed to God. But it is surprising to

\* Even by the Pope, who is reported to have sent his blessing by telegraph on the occasion of the funeral of Charles Waterton, Esq. What would the Apostle Peter have thought of this proceeding?

find that Christianity should become infected with the poisonous weed of Pantheism and mysticism, so essentially heathen in its origin. Nevertheless, we discover this parasite very early, and deeply intermingling its radical principle with the elements of Christian truth, and before many centuries of our era had elapsed, we find the development of mystical doctrines assisting largely in the decline of the Christian church.

*"Miratur novos frondes, et non sua poma."*

The history of the Christian church has not yet been fully written, and amongst other chasms in our knowledge is that of the exact means by which these doctrines entered the Church; but we can hardly doubt that their origin was in the Eastern mysticism which forms the substance of the philosophy of India and, through Buddhism, of Thibet and China also, and which dates, as regards its essential principles, from immemorial antiquity—certainly very far before the commencement of our era. The following passage I extract from a little treatise I published on this subject nearly thirty years ago. The quotation is taken from "The Asiatic Researches," vol. xi., p. 125, and is a description of Hindoo philosophy:—

"Ask a Hindoo, whether learned or unlearned, 'Do you worship the Supreme Being? Do you

pray to Him? Do you offer sacrifices to Him? He will answer immediately, 'No, never!'—'You certainly worship Him *mentally*, which is the purest sort of worship, and which becomes, it seems, fashionable, as it subjects us to very little or no inconvenience?' He will answer, 'No!'—'Do you praise Him?' 'No!'—'Do you meditate on his attributes and perfections?' 'No!'—'What is then that silent meditation mentioned by some learned authors?' His answer will be, 'When I perform the puja, etc. . . . I compose my mind and thoughts, and, without moving the tongue or using any of the organs of speech, I say inwardly, "I am Brahme, or the Supreme Being." We are not conscious of being Brahme through (maya) worldly illusion, but we know it *by revelation*. It is forbidden to adore the Supreme Being, to offer prayers and sacrifices to Him, for it would be worshipping ourselves; but we may adore and worship collateral emanations from Him, and of a superior degree; we may adore and worship even mere mortals, etc. Of which kind of worship,' say the Hindoos, 'there are many instances recorded. The worship of images is recommended, when after consecration the Deity has been called down and forced into them with powerful spells.\* Whenever a man can

\* Compare *transubstantiation*, supposed to be effected when the words *hoc est corpus*, etc., are pronounced in the service of the mass.

divest himself of every worldly affection, whether good or bad, by self-denial; and has extinguished, that is to say, subdued his senses; the inferior deities disappear, etc., and at that very moment he is conscious of being Brahme!"

That is to say, of being God! In accordance with this notion I may mention that Mr. Start, who lived some twenty years in India, and warmly supported the missions there, once said to me, "All the Brahmins you meet would say, if you asked them about their need of a Saviour, 'I do not need a Saviour;' but if you talk to them about God, they would say, 'It is all very well to talk about God—I am God.'" This was the usual answer. The reply of Mr. Start was "Does God then tell lies, for you tell lies?" He generally found that this put a stop to their talk, for they did not like to assert so much. They thus found, after all, that there was some distinction between them and God—"God that cannot lie!" Even Pythagoras could say that men most resembled the gods "in doing good and *speaking truth*."

"The devotees who make it their principal aim to realize the emancipation of the spirit are called Yogis."\* The Yogi takes this course. "He is recluse, of a subdued mind and spirit, free from hope and free from perception. He planteth his own seat firmly on a spot that is undefiled, neither too

\* "Vaughan's Mystics," i. 63.

high nor too low, and sitteth upon the sacred grass, which is called Koos, covered with a skin and a cloth. There he whose business is the restraining of his passions should sit with his mind fixed on one object alone; in the exercise of his devotion for the purification of his soul, keeping his head, his neck, and body steady, without motion; his eyes fixed on the point of his nose, looking at no other place around." The missionary Ward, in describing this, tells us that, "In the latest stage the eyes also are closed, while the fingers and even bandages are employed to obstruct almost completely the avenues of respiration. Then the soul is said to be united to the energies of the body; both mount and are as it were concentrated in the skull, whence the spirit escapes by the basilar suture, and, the body having been thus abandoned, the incorporeal nature is reunited for a season to the supreme." "He who in the body hath obtained liberation—that is, has gone through this process—is of no caste, of no sect, of no order; attends to no duties, adheres to no shastras, to no formulas, to no works of merit; *he is beyond the reach of speech*; he remains at a distance from all secular concerns; he has renounced the love and the knowledge of sensible objects; he is glorious as the autumnal sky; he flatters none, he honours none; whether he practises and follows the customs of his country or not this is his character."

Unhappily, however, the character of these men is universally, practically bad, as may very well be when they attend to no duties ; and it is not strange that this should have been the effect. " Pantheism sacrifices the personality of God, in hopes of making more of man. What is the result ? It destroys human personality. So true is this profound saying of a contemporary spiritualist, ' There are two poles of all human science—the personal I with whom all begins, and the personal God in whom all ends.' Yes, man without God is an enigma—I know not what—an inexplicable monster. He has no mission upon earth, and no hope in heaven. Losing his divine ideal trying to take himself for his ideal, he falls below himself, and his punishment for desiring to be God is, that he ceases to be man."\*

The mode followed by mystics to attain perfection, is well illustrated by Plotinus,† who, although not a Christian, was one whose views were either themselves influential, or else expressed the influential kind of views adopted, to a very great extent, by the Church about the third or fourth century. He explains them thus :—

" There is a raying out of all orders of existence, an external emanation from the ineffable One. There is again a returning impulse, drawing all upwards

\* Saisset, " Modern Pantheism," ii. p. 122.

† " Vaughan's Hours with the Mystics," p. 87.

and inwards towards the centre from whence all came." "The wise man recognizes the idea of the good within him. This he develops by withdrawing into the Holy Place of his own soul. He who does not understand how the soul contains the beautiful within itself, seeks to realize beauty without by laborious production. His aim should rather be to concentrate and simplify, and so to expand his being; instead of going out into the manifold, to forsake it for the One, and so to float upwards towards the divine fount of being whose stream flows within him. You ask how can we know the Infinite? I answer, not by reason. It is the office of reason to distinguish and define. The infinite, therefore, cannot be ranked among its objects. You can only apprehend the Infinite by a faculty superior to reason, by entering into a state in which you are your finite self no longer, in which the divine essence is communicated to you. This is ecstasy. It is the liberation of your mind from its finite consciousness. Like only can comprehend like; when you thus cease to be finite you become one with the Infinite. In the reduction of your soul to its simplest self, its divine essence, you realize this union, this identity."

Iamblicus, about the same period, speaks thus :  
"The pomp of emperors becomes as nothing in

\* "Vaughan," p. 107—110.



comparison with the glory that surrounds the hierophant. The priest is a prophet full of deity. The subordinate powers of the upper world are at his bidding, for it is not a man, but a God who speaks the word of power. Such a man lives no longer the life common to other men. He has exchanged the human life for the divine. His nature is the instrument and vehicle of deity, who fills and impels him. Men of this order do not employ, in the elevation they experience, the waking senses as do others. They have no purpose of their own, no mastery over themselves. They speak wisdom they do not understand, and their faculties absorbed in a divine power, become the utterance of a superior will. Often at the moment of inspiration, or when the afflatus has subsided, a fiery appearance is seen—the entering or departing Power. Those who are skilled in this wisdom can tell by the character of this glory the rank of the divinity who has seized for the time the reins of the mystic's soul, and guides it as he will. Sometimes the body of the man subject to this influence is violently agitated, sometimes it is rigid and motionless."

"In some instances sweet music is heard, in others discordant and fearful sounds. The person of the subject has been known to dilate and tower to a superhuman height; in other cases it has been lifted up into the air. Frequently not merely the exercise of reason, but sensation and animal life

would appear to have been suspended; and the subject of the afflatus has not felt the application of fire, has been pierced with spits, cut with knives, and been sensible of no pain. Yea often, the more the body and the mind have been alike onfeebled by vigil and by fasts, the more ignorant or mentally imbecile a youth may be who is brought under this influence, the more freely and unmixedly will the divine power be made manifest. 'So clearly are these wonders the work not of human skill or wisdom, but of supernatural agency! Characteristics such as these I have mentioned are the marks of the true inspiration.'

I bring these passages before you as an introduction to the mysticism of the Christian Church—as giving a little idea of the strange parentage of this thoroughly un-Christian idea of the soul being part of God; and to recall to your minds also the name of Philo and the Alexandrian school, to whom I referred in a previous lecture as having borne so large a part in introducing the Apocrypha into the Christian Church. They also had very much to do with these notions, which were unhappily adopted, to a great extent, by the early fathers of the Christian Church. From them we may trace the course of the stream into the German mysticism, and the names of Taulerus, Thomas-à-Kempis, and the Friends of God, and many others, occur in this connection. Many of the works of

these German mystics have been translated into English, and have been much read; they are all infected with the same sort of views as those I have been describing: and whilst I am not going to say that many of these may not have been good men—whilst I am very far from sitting in judgment upon them—for I have only to do with their opinions—I must say that with those opinions I hold no fellowship at all. I consider that the works containing them are dangerous books, and that they have influenced many minds injuriously, and have led, more than is often known, to evil consequences in the Christian Church in our own day and in our own land.

Let us take, next in order, Madame Guyon.\* Her views are very attractive to a large class of minds. A great deal is said about the love of God, but very little as to how that love is to become ours, or is to be made known to the soul. Very little is said about the work of Christ in redemption—very little about the power of his atoning blood. She describes her entry into a paradise of feeling as connected with being told that she was to find God within her; which, of course, with certain limitations and understandings, may be supposed to be true; but every sinner must know that, to find God within him, he needs to believe in the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin, before

\* Vaughan, ii. 370.

he can meet God with acceptance. Far be it from me to say that Madame Guyon did not also find the Lamb of God, but I desire to point your attention to one particular feature in her life—very much more prominently brought forward in the French memoir than in ours—how greatly she was under the control of another (herself, perhaps, partly controlling), the priest or father confessor: thus showing the extraordinary way in which, in her case, as often happens with mystics, man takes the place which should only be occupied by God. Her confessors, or spiritual directors, filled a place in her mind and feelings to an extent that one cannot consider beautiful or lovely, or of good repute, though she was as far from anything like gross evil as any one could be. Hers was a mind of much refinement, and this was greatly her preservative in the midst of what, in other respects, one cannot but consider blameworthy. Observe the manner in which she speaks of Father La Combe:—

“There also” (at Thonon) “she underwent some of her most painful and mysterious experiences with regard to Father La Combe.\* She says: ‘Our Lord gave me, with the weaknesses of a child, such a power over souls, that with a word I put them in pain or in peace, as was necessary for their good. I saw that God made Himself to be obeyed, in and through me, like an absolute sovereign. I neither resisted him nor took part in anything. . . . Our

Lord had given us both' (herself and Father La Combe) 'to understand that He would unite us by faith and by the cross.' "

This for a married lady seems rather strange—to be united in spirit to another than her husband by faith and by the cross.

" 'Ours, then, has been a union of the cross in every respect, as well by what I have made him suffer as by what I have suffered for him. . . . The sufferings which I have had on his account were such as to reduce me sometimes to extremity, which continued several years; for though I have been much more of my time far from him than near him, that did not relieve my suffering, which continued till he was perfectly emptied of himself, and to the very point of submission which God required of him. . . . He hath occasioned me cruel pains when I was near a hundred leagues from him. I felt his disposition. If he was faithful in letting self be destroyed I was in a state of peace and enlargement. If he was unfaithful in reflection, or hesitation, I suffered till that was passed over. "He had no need to write me an account of his condition, for I knew it; but when he did write it proved to be such as I had felt it.' She says that frequently, when Father La Combe came to confess her, she could not speak a word to him; she felt take place within her the same silence toward him which she had experienced in regard to God. 'I understood,'

she adds, 'that God wished to teach me that this language might be learnt by men on earth—that is, converse without words.' She was gradually reduced to this wordless communication alone, in her interviews with La Combe, and they imagined that they understood each other in a manner ineffable and divine. She regarded the use of speech or of the pen as a kind of accommodation on her part to the weakness of souls not sufficiently advanced for these internal communications."

The views of Madame Guyon were to a considerable extent adopted by Wesley. He drew part of his doctrine from the Moravians, and in addition to the Moravian doctrine of redemption by the blood of Christ, of which he had a very clear view, he also adopted mysticism from Madame Guyon and others; and in connection with this are the ideas of perfection and of Pelagianism which prevail in his writings. These views, not founded on Scripture, losing sight of the infinite distinction there must ever be betwixt the sinner and the Creator, certainly deteriorated his doctrine, and have been through him widely influential. Without at all detracting from the great excellence of many of those who look up to Mr. Wesley as their leader (much indeed has been done by them to bring ignorant persons to the knowledge of Christ), still the truth remains as I have said. In another direction I see the same influence at work. Looking back to the first origin of the Friends, I

find views which are not shared at all generally by the "Friends" of the present day, but which nevertheless, when understood in connection with the German mysticism, I have been speaking of, seem to be of exactly the same character. George Fox, in a book called "The Great Mystery," speaks of the soul as a part of God; and this gives one to understand what he meant by the light within, "the inward light."\* It was not the doctrine of the Holy Spirit as understood by Christians in general; but this mystical view, which represents that a man, by sinking down into himself, and withdrawing from all sensible objects, and closing the avenues of his senses, can meet with God within. In connection with this he thus speaks in the preface of his work†:—"All languages are to me no more than dust, *who was before languages were*, and am come'd before languages were, and am redeemed out of languages into the power where men shall agree."

This is extraordinary language—not so extraordinary, however, as that of some of the German mystics; but we see, on full consideration, who is supposed to be speaking—not George Fox but God

\* "God breathed into man the breath of life, and he became a living soul. God, who hath all souls in his hand. And is not this that cometh out from God, which is in God's hand, *part of God*, of God and from God, and to God again, which soul Christ is the bishop of?"—"Fox's Great Mystery," p. 100.

† "The Battledore," etc., 1660, signed G. Fox, John Stubbs, B. Furley, and the separate papers in *various languages*, G. F. 6

within him, claiming that "He was before all languages were." There are other things connected with his life which I do not wish to dwell upon now, which show that mysticism prevailed to a great extent with him and some others of the early Friends. These views have been to a considerable degree renounced by that body, but in some quarters their influence remains; views such as those of Madame Guyon, which prevent a person from seeing clearly that they are sinners and need a Saviour. If these views were true, man must have power of recovery within himself, even without a Saviour. He need perhaps to recover himself out of a bad and fallen state, but nevertheless there must be the divine spark within him that merely wants fanning into a flame; and this is the idea which many persons entertain, not only in the society which claims to be descended from George Fox, but also in other quarters as well. These views are in fact fashionable, and assist widely in the corruption of the Christian Church. Those who are conversant with the Christian literature of the day can readily trace this out. Such views very easily coincide, for example, with the doctrine of sacramental efficacy. But wherever these mystical ideas—losing sight of the distinction between God and the creature—prevail, there always follows this consequence, that the Scriptures are placed below the Spirit, and instead of the Scriptures being looked to as the authoritative standard, the Spirit is looked



to as the standard. I need scarcely say, what a capricious standard that must be which is in every man's bosom, capable of being interpreted by every man differently from every other man—a theory which developed itself in the early history of the Friends, so that it was very difficult to establish church government amongst them. Robert Barclay who was an able leader, wrote a book\* to show “the ancient apostolic order of the Church of Christ re-established among them (the Quakers), and settled upon its right basis and foundation. He was seconded by William Penn, in a work called “A Brief Examination, etc., of Liberty Spiritual,” showing that this individual light that was in every man's bosom was not to be trusted, but that the only thing to be confided in was the collected light when all was gathered together in one in a kind of church council governed by its apostles or elders. The efforts of these leaders resulted in setting up, notwithstanding the outburst of democracy which marked early Quakerism, the very strong church government that has since prevailed in that body.

The argument on which this rests is a very simple one, and may be thus stated:—

“A church, in the Scripture phrase, is no other

\* Called “The Anarchy of the Ranters and other Libertines, the Hierarchy of the Romanists and other pretended Churches, equally Refused and Refuted, in a Twofold Apology for the Church and People of God, called in derision Quakers,” etc. ‘

than a meeting or gathering of certain people which (if it be taken in a religious sense, as most commonly it is) are *gathered together in the belief of the same principles, doctrines, and points of faith whereby, as a body, they become distinguished from others, and have a certain relation among themselves, and a conjunct interest to the maintaining and propagating those principles they judge to be right* " (p. 28).

But "the church and people of God, called in derision Quakers," have been thus gathered together since "the Lord God by his mighty power began to visit the nations with the dawning of his heavenly day" (p. 5); and they became separated from "the Romanists, and other pretended churches" (title page).

Now it is manifest that in the early church there was government by means of apostles, elders, etc. Therefore amongst the church of the Quakers the same must be established.

And "where there is any gathering or assembly, which truly and properly may be called the Church of Christ, *the infallible judgment will never be wanting in matters of controversy*" (p. 27).

But this infallible judgment does not reside in every member, "since the Lord doth ordinarily make use of the strong to support the weak." "Now then let us consider whom the Lord makes use of in the affairs of the primitive Church, and through whom He gave forth his infallible judgment. Did He not begin first by Peter. He was the first that spake

in the first meeting they had. . . . So also the Apostle Paul argues from his gathering of the churches of Corinth and Galatia that they ought to be followers of him, and positively concludes in divers things" (p. 74). It is therefore, generally, the apostles of the church who decide. Nevertheless, a weak member may possibly become strong and give forth "an infallible judgment."

The practical conclusion of the whole is therefore that *very weak members* may possibly come to be accounted strong (p. 73) by cultivating more *especially* those particulars in which the sect differs from other Christians, the principles, doctrines, and points of faith whereby they are distinguished from others: and thus their *infallible judgment* may come to take the place even of that of the early apostles of the sect (to say nothing of the Scriptures), and it follows that for such *weak ones* to exercise that place in the body which the Head moves them to, is *not to usurp authority over their fellow members*. As on the other hand, to submit and obey, *it being the place of some so to do*, is *not a renouncing a being led by the Spirit* (p. 76), seeing the Spirit leads them so to do. And this is the very thing which had to be demonstrated.

In the celebrated apology\* of Barclay, we find very carefully stated that which I have been speaking of as regards the Scriptures being after all

\* Barclay's Ap., Prop. iii. § ii.

secondary to the Spirit. He says in the third proposition:—"Though we do acknowledge the Scriptures to be a very heavenly and divine writing; . . . yet we may not call them the principal fountain of all truth and knowledge, nor yet the first adequate rule of faith and manners, because the principal fountain of truth must be the truth itself, *i. e.*, that whose certainty and authority depend not upon another. When we doubt of the streams of any river or flood, we recur to the fountain itself, and having found it there we desist, we can go no further because there it springs out of the bowels of the earth, which are inscrutable. Even so the writing and sayings of all men we must bring to the Word of God, I mean the eternal word, and if they agree hereunto, we stand there."

But then how have I access to this eternal word? George Fox and Barclay say I have God in myself—I have only to sink down into myself and then I have access to the eternal word, and I can try the Scriptures and everything in them by this internal word; just as the German mystic says he can try everything by his internal intuition. But suppose the Scriptures do not happen to agree with this light within? Then of course the Scriptures are little thought of.

Now what, after all, would be the standard of morality if, instead of having the standard of truth in the Scriptures which God has given us, we were

left to try everything by our own internal consciousness? The result may be seen in mysticism, and in the morality it produces. "The following passage from Jelaleddin exhibits the kind of identity with God claimed by the more extravagant devotees of Sufism :—\*

"Are we fools, we're God's captivity ;  
Are we wise, we are his promenade ;  
Are we sleeping, we are drunk with God ;  
Are we waking, then we are his heralds ;  
Are we weeping, then his clouds of wrath ;  
Are we laughing, flashes of his love."

"Some among them carried their presumption to a practical extreme which did away with all distinction between good and evil. They declared the sins of the Sufi dearer to God than the obedience of other men, and his impiety more acceptable than their faith."

I find the same sort of thing—this setting the Spirit above the Word—among those who have followed Mr. J. N. Darby.†

Starting with much *professed* deference to Scripture, they have come now to an obedience to the *dicta* of their leaders, for which no reason can be assigned, but that which I have above stated.

\* Vaughan i. 339.

† Mr. Darby's doctrine is modified Irvingism, and partakes to a considerable extent of the tinge of mysticism. See "A Review of the Great Doctrine of Imputed Righteousness, also The Adam-life Doctrine," etc., by T. Ryan, Esq. London, 1865.

One of, their preachers, who gained near the metropolis a position and patronage as a professed evangelist, recently declared that "it was shown him by the Spirit, in *the silence of his own chamber, where nothing but the Spirit's voice could be heard*, that *all* the ministers of the different denominations in his neighbourhood were (spiritually) dead, and leading their flocks down to perdition."

It is obvious that the Scripture must take a very secondary place with persons who imagine themselves favoured with such revelations.

And now, to bring these lectures to a close; I have sought to show, in the first place, that the Scriptures are the oracles of God, and must necessarily be received as such by all who bow to the authority of Christ, so that it is not to be admitted that any should reject Christ's authority and still call themselves *Christians*; also that the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments were received by those witnesses whom God raised up from age to age to proclaim his will, and bear witness for his glory; that these Scriptures were never given forth as "the book" apart from the people, but as a book given to the people; and to be lived out in the lives of the people. A very important practical consideration this for those who profess to be believers in Christ; for such are, after all, the book which mankind can most easily read. "Ye are the

epistles of Christ," Paul says, writing to his Christian converts—Christ's letter of recommendation to the world—and if that is blotted and illegible, the world will think badly of Him whom it recommends. I maintain that God has always linked these two things together—the testimony of his people, and the word which He puts into their hands, together with the attractive winning power which, going forth from his loving people, should lead others to see in them manifested the God of love.

Then we have looked at some of the objections resulting from what is called the higher criticism; and then again from scientific difficulties; and have seen that though there are difficulties in Scripture, just as there are difficulties in nature, yet that we should as devoutly receive the Bible as from God, as we receive nature as from God. God is the author of both revelations, and the gospel is the revelation of his love just as nature is a revelation of his power and wisdom.

Further, we have shown how absolutely needful it is for men to receive the testimony which God has given in the Scriptures to his own glorious Being as infinitely above the creature, and as in no way to be confounded with the creature; and so to be humbled and abased, and to receive in all simplicity and humility of mind, God's teachings, so beautifully adapted to us as they are in the Scriptures—so clear and full, so suited to old and

young, rich and poor, healthy and suffering. All can come to the Scriptures, and find suitable instruction.

Going through these subjects, I cannot but bless God for the view which is presented to the mind of the glorious suitability of the Scriptures to God's people while here on earth. We should always remember that they are but the scaffolding—God's people are the building, the temple that is to be erected to his praise to all eternity. The scaffolding may be taken down, but it shows the wonderful goodness of God that He has given such a glorious revelation of Himself to help us on our way to heaven.

All I can say, in conclusion, is to commend these precious Scriptures to you. May you and I grow in the knowledge of that Blessed One who is revealed in them as God the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. May He become more and more precious to us, until we reach that happy scene, when we shall no more need the light of an earthly book; but when, in the person of the Blessed Saviour, we shall see all things unfolded in Him who is the light of the golden city, for "The Lamb is the light thereof."



# APPENDIX.



## A.

### PAGE 96.—THE CAMEL.

A Frenchman, an Englishman, and a German, were commissioned, it is said, to give the world the benefit of their views on that interesting animal, the camel. Away went the Frenchman to the Jardin des Plantes, spent an hour there in rapid investigation, returned, and wrote a feuilleton, in which there was no phrase the Academy could blame, but also no phrase which added to the general knowledge. He was perfectly satisfied, however, and said, "*Le voilà, le chameau!*" The Englishman packed up his tea-caddy and a magazine of comforts; pitched his tent in the East; remained there two years studying the camel in its habits; and returned with a thick volume of facts arranged without order, expounded without philosophy, but serving as valuable materials for all who came after him. The German, despising the frivolity of the Frenchman, and the unphilosophic matter-of-factness of the Englishman, retired to his study, there to construct the idea of a camel from out of the depths of his moral consciousness. And he is still at it. With this myth the reader is introduced into the very heart of that species of criticism, which, flourishing in Germany, is also admired in some English circles, under the guise of Philosophical Criticism."—*Lewis's Life of Goëthe*, page 392.

---

## B.

### PAGE 149.

"The origin of man is a *myth*, which each race interprets in its own way; formules after the fashion of its own intellectual bearing, retouches as it makes progress in arts, literature, and science, that is in civilization.

"I mean not here to discuss these myths. The *Jewish myth*

seems to have been a purely material one ; *philosophic, and sublimely simple, it offers no details.* The Coptic and Hindoo was spiritual and lofty, but debased by shocking obscenities ; the minds of the races were not equal to the perception of the perfect and the beautiful. The Scandinavian myth was coarse and brutal ; material in its essence, the hideous representations of the Deity in India, China, Mongolia, and Polynesia, indicate the sad character of the minds of these races.—*Dr. Knox, Races, etc., p. 749.*

---

C.

PAGE 149.—THE NOBLE DOG.

Buffon writes :—

“ Un naturel ardent, colère, même féroce et sanguinaire, rend le chien sauvage redoutable à tous les animaux, et cède, dans le chien domestique, aux sentimens les plus doux, au plaisir de s'attacher et au désir de plaire ; il vient en rampant mettre aux pieds de son maître son courage, sa force, ses talents ; il attend ses ordres pour en faire usage ; il le consulte, il l'interroge, il le supplie ; il entend les signes de sa volonté ; sans avoir, comme l'homme, la lumière de la pensée, il a tout la chaleur du sentiment ; il a plus que lui la fidélité, la constance dans ses affections ; nulle ambition, nul intérêt, nul désir de vengeance, nulle crainte que celle de déplaire ; il est tout zèle, tout ardeur et tout obéissance ; plus sensible au souvenir des bienfaits qu'à celui des outrages, il ne se rebute pas par les mauvais traitements ; il les subit, les oublie, ou ne s'en souvient que pour s'attacher davantage ; loin de s'irriter ou de fuir, il s'expose de lui-même à de nouvelles épreuves ; il lèche cette main, instrument de douleur qui vient de le frapper ; il ne lui oppose que la plainte, et la désarme enfin par la patience et la soumission.”

It is indeed admirable to see to how great an extent man is permitted to be, and was indeed designed to be, a fellow-worker with God in improving his creation. He is indeed not allowed to be a creator, but by selection and development he is allowed to produce *races* in the animal kingdom, and varieties in the vegetable kingdom

which rise almost to the dignity and permanence of species. Such are the faculties of this gifted being, who, according to our philosophers, was so much neglected by his own Creator, as not even to have been endowed with language! How different and how much more *probable* is the scriptural account. Adam was placed in a garden, and horticulture and zoology were made his studies, in connection with the teaching of this gracious Benefactor, in language imparted by the Divine Logos, for "in Him was life, and the life was the light of men." "And whatsoever Adam called every living creature, that was the name thereof."

*From Sir Charles Lyell's "Antiquity of Man," p. 468.*

"It was a profound saying of William Humboldt, that 'Man is man only by means of speech, but in order to invent speech he must be already man.' Other animals may be able to utter sounds more articulate and as varied as the click of the Bushman, but voice alone can never enable brute intelligence to acquire language.

"When we consider the complexity of every form of speech spoken by a highly civilized nation, and discover that the grammatical rules and inflections which denote number, time, and quality, are usually the products of a rude state of society,—that the savage and the sage, the peasant and the man of letters, the child and the philosopher have *worked together, in the course of many generations to build up* a fabric which has been truly described as a wonderful instrument of thought—a machine, the several parts of which are so well adjusted to each other, as to *resemble the product of one period and of a single mind*—we cannot but look upon the result as a *profound mystery*, and one of which the separate builders have been almost as unconscious as are the bees in a hive of the architectural skill and mathematical knowledge which is displayed in the construction of a honeycomb.

"In our attempts to account for the origin of species we find ourselves still sooner brought face to face with the working of a *law of development of so high an order, as to stand nearly in the same relation as the Deity himself to man's finite understanding, a law CAPABLE of adding new and powerful CAUSES, such as the moral and intellectual faculties of the human race (!) to a system of nature* which had gone on for millions of years without the inter-

vention of any analogous cause. If we confound 'Variation,' or 'Natural Selection' with such *creational laws*, we *deify secondary causes*, or immeasurably exaggerate their influence."

It is not, I admit, an easy matter to comprehend the <sup>2</sup>exact meaning of the concluding sentence of the portion which I have quoted. I do not refer to the *profound mystery*, or rather *profound impossibility*, which those who reject the scriptural account find themselves obliged to account for; but my business is with the new *quasi-Deity* to which we are introduced, whose name appears to be "*A law of development of a high order*," whom we are most carefully to distinguish from "Variation," or "Selection," lest we should *deify* these, or, in other words, worship "Selection-God," and "Variation-God," instead of which the above LAW who is *nearly* God (as far as man can make out) and has conferred on man (after he had been developing "for millions of years without the intervention of any analogous cause,") the "intellectual faculties" by which the human race have been enabled at length to comprehend their *Creator*, and to worship Him as a not-quite God called LAW.

## D.

PAGE 150.

I have been asked my opinion as to the recently propounded dogma of the immense antiquity of man. My reply is that this forms no part of my creed, seeing it is manifestly contrary to the statements of revelation and incompatible with Christianity; if the Scriptural account of the origin of man is a fable, so must be also that of his redemption; if the human race are not fallen in the first Adam, neither are they redeemed in the second Adam. Nor is this something peculiar in my mode of viewing the subject, but it seems to be well understood to be incompatible with any intelligent belief in Christianity. The world must therefore take its choice, and consider whether the arguments for the new gospel appear to preponderate, and whether the Christian faith, with all natural religion or belief in the existence of a wise and beneficent Creator must be openly disavowed in accordance with the dictates of an

infirm philosophy.\* A distinguished advocate of the doctrine, of whose private sentiments I know nothing, writes thus :—

“The opinion entertained generally by the classical writers of Greece and Rome, that man in the first stage of his existence was but just removed from the brutes, is faithfully expressed by Horace in his celebrated lines, which begin—

‘Quum prorepserunt primis animalia terris.’

Sat. lib. i. 3, 99.

“The picture of *transmutation* given in these verses, however severe and contemptuous the strictures lavishly bestowed on it by Christian commentators, accords singularly with the train of thought which the modern doctrine of progressive development has encouraged.

“‘When animals,’ he says, ‘first crept forth from the newly formed earth a dumb and filthy herd, they fought for acorns and lurking places with their nails and fists, then with clubs, and at last with arms, which, taught by experience, they had forged. They then invented names for things, and words to express their thoughts, after which they began to desist from war, to fortify cities, and to enact laws.’

“*They who in later times have embraced a similar theory, have been led to it by no deference to the opinions of their pagan predecessors, but rather in spite of very strong prepossessions in favour of an opposite hypothesis—namely, that of the superiority of their original progenitors, of whom they believe themselves to be the corrupt and degenerate descendants.*

“*So far as they are guided by palæontology, they arrive at this result by an independent course of reasoning, but they have been conducted partly to the same goal as the ancients by ethnological considerations common to both, or by reflecting in what darkness the infancy of every nation is developed, and that true history and chronology are the creation, as it were, of yesterday !”\**

For myself, I acknowledge that the contemplation of the existence of man for “*tens or thousands of centuries*,” as “*a mute and shameful herd*,” without any evident purport in his existence but that of a destroyer of the nobler portions of creation, would lead to conclusions similar to those of the imperial critic on the works of

\* Sir C. Lyell, “Antiquity of Man.”

God, who declared that when he looked on the general order of the Universe, he was so struck with the proofs of wisdom and contrivance everywhere, that he was induced to believe there was a Creator, but that when he contemplated the disorder and misery of man, he came to the conclusion that such a Being did not exist, or his chief work would have been more in harmony with the above attributes.

As it is prudent, however, to weigh well the 'confirmations strong as holy writ,' (which, indeed, should be stronger), by which we are to be induced to plunge back into the night of heathenism, before taking the awful and irretrievable step, it is needful to look carefully into the proofs; and it then appears that their formidable and most bulky array is singularly deficient in that force and cohesion and irresistible cogency which would be required to overthrow all the host of arguments which have been brought forward from every quarter in favour of revelation. The body of witnesses, imposing at first by their appearance of number, break down when they come into court, and are separately examined. Each has an uncertain tale to tell.

Take first as direct testimony, that of Dr. B. Dowler, whose statements are thus reproduced by Sir C. Lyell.\*

"At the depth of *sixteen* feet from the surface, beneath four buried forests superimposed one upon another (!) the workmen are *stated*, by Dr. B. Dowler, to have found some charcoal and a human skeleton, the cranium of which is *said* to belong to the aboriginal type of the Red Indian race. As the discovery in question had not been made when I saw the excavation in progress at the gas works in 1846, *I cannot form an opinion* as to the *value* of the *chronological* calculations which have led Dr. Dowler to ascribe to this skeleton an antiquity of 50,000 years." *Fifty thousand years!!!—P. 42.*

Next Hekekyan Bey—

"Some new facts of *high interest*, illustrating the geology of the alluvial land of Egypt were brought to light between the years 1851 and 1854. . . . Several engineers and a body of sixty workmen were employed under the superintendence of Hekekyan Bey . . . in a season which would have been fatal to Europeans.

\* "The Geological Evidences of the Antiquity of Man," by Sir Charles Lyell, F.R.S. 1863, page 43.

"Pieces of burnt brick and pottery were extracted almost everywhere, even when they sank sixty feet below the surface, towards the central parts of the valley. . . . It has been objected, among other criticisms, *that the Arabs can always find whatever their employers desire to obtain.*"—P. 33.

Surely this testimony, on which so much stress has been laid, is very weak. No doubt the Arabs would have professed to find English sovereigns sixty feet below the surface if well paid for their trouble, and with no EUROPEAN to check them.

Again, to select two other of the most prominent witnesses (chap. xi.) :—

"Among the fossil remains of the human species supposed to have claims to high antiquity, and which have for many years attracted attention, two of the *most prominent* examples are—First, 'The fossil man of Denise.' . . . Secondly, 'The fossil human bone of Natchez.' . . . It is not conceivable that the less coherent part of the museum specimen which envelopes the human bones should have been artificially put together, *whatever may have been the origin of certain other slabs of tuff*, which were afterwards sold as coming from the same place, and which *also contained human remains*. Whether some of these were spurious or not is a question *more* difficult to decide. One of them, now in the possession of M. Pichot Dumasal, an advocate of Le Puy is *suspected*, etc., etc. Granting, however, that *the high price given for human fossils at Le Puy may have led to the perpetration of some frauds*, it is still an interesting question to consider whether *the admission of the genuineness of a single fossil*, such as that now in the museum at Le Puy, would lead us to assign a higher antiquity to the existence of man in France than is *deducible from many OTHER FACTS explained in the last seven chapters.*"

Certainly seven chapters of similar *facts* would not carry conviction to the mind that was not previously inclined to implicit faith.

When the Natchez *man*, or rather bone, "the pelvic bone of a man, os innominatum, was obtained by Dr. Dickeson, of Natchez, in whose collection I saw it, it appeared to be quite in the same state of preservation, and was of the same black colour as the other fossils, and was *believed* to have come like them from a depth of about thirty feet from the surface . . . *may POSSIBLY have been derived from the vegetable soil at the top of the cliff!* . . .

*might, I conceived have acquired its black colour by having lain for years or centuries in a dark, superficial, peaty soil, common in that region. I was informed that there were many human bones in old Indian graves in the same district stained of as black a die. . . . It is ALLOWABLE to suspend our judgment as to the high antiquity of the fossil."* . . . However . . . if I was right in calculating that the present delta of the Mississippi has required as a minimum of time more than one hundred thousand years for its growth, it would follow, *if the claims of the Natchez man (bone?) to have co-existed with the mastodon are ADMITTED (!) that North America was peopled more than a thousand centuries ago by the human race ! !"*

This is truly setting a pyramid on its point: how can this rotten bone of dubious origin, in itself one of the most perishable in the human body, and ill-calculated to last even *fifty* years under the conditions named, sustain the load of a thousand centuries of human history, and such history too?

Next the "Fossil human skeleton of the Neanderthal" cave, near Dusseldorf—

"When the skull and other parts of the skeleton were first exhibited at a German scientific meeting at Bonn in 1857, some doubts were expressed by several naturalists, *whether it was truly human. . . .* When, on my return to England, I showed the cast of the cranium to Professor Huxley, he remarked at once that it was the most ape-like skull he had ever beheld. Mr. Busk . . . added some valuable comments of his own on the characters in which the skull approached that of the gorilla and chimpanzee."—P. 75.

Who shall certify us that this may not be the skeleton of a pre-Adamite anthropoid ape; and if it be such, what becomes of the reasoning which rests on its *assumed* human character?

It seems on the whole, as Sir C. L. indeed admits, "*that geologists have occasionally been deceived,*" and we may not unreasonably unite in the expectation "that ere long, now that curiosity has been so much excited on this subject, some human remains will be detected in the older alluvium of European valleys. In the mean time *the absence of all vestiges of the bones which belonged to the population by which so many weapons were designed and executed . . . is a new and emphatic illustration of the extreme imperfection of the geologic record, of which even they who are constantly working in the field cannot easily form a just conception.*"—P. 62.



I have myself long believed in the co-existence of man with many now extinct species of mammalia, indeed, "an argument *having an opposite leaning*" to that (of the "Antiquity of Man") may, as Lyell admits, be founded on certain phenomena. "It may, indeed, it has been said, imply that some of the extinct mammalia survived nearly to our times."—P. 190. The entire rhinoceros seen by Pallas in Siberia in the year 1772, the description by Cæsar of the *Bos longifrons*, and of the reindeer as existing in his day in Gaul, the traditionary destruction of the mammoths in America, and of the huge "Moa" birds in New Zealand, and the description of the leviathan and behemoth in Job, all point in this direction.

I may therefore believe that at some period of the earth's history it was freely wandered over by a race of hunters and fishermen, perhaps at the era when "it was corrupt and filled with violence," and that these came into conflict with the mammoths and mastodons of the old world. I may believe that those old world wanderers were singularly tenacious of their own lives, and remarkably careless about their flint tools: without extending the period at which they lived to such an inconceivably distant past. As with the mortal remains of the eleven thousand companions of St. Ursula at Cologne, I believe *something*, but only a very small portion of what is told me, since it does not appear that the amount of evidence adduced will sustain the conclusions.

In references to other branches of the inquiry, there seems to me a similar want of proportion between the amount of proof and the demands made on our credulity. Admissions such as the following are most startling:—

"*What may be the antiquity of the earliest human remains preserved in the Danish peat cannot be estimated in centuries with any approach to accuracy.*"—P. 16.

"*How many generations of each species of tree flourished in succession before the pine was supplanted by the oak, and the oak by the beech, can be but vaguely conjectured, but the minimum of time required for the formation of so much peat must, according to the estimate of Steenstrup and other good authorities, have amounted to at least four thousand years.*"—P. 16.

"*There is no small risk of error in speculating on the relative claims to antiquity of such ancient tribes, for some of them may*

have remained isolated for ages and stationary in their habits, while others advanced and improved."—P. 29.

I have no difficulty in believing (though with some restrictions) in the sequence of a stone, a bronze, and an iron age, often perhaps overlapping each other in date. I may feel a certain amount of interest in the proofs that the filthy race of primitive Lapps, or rather Esquimaux, devoured their oysters and deposited the refuse in the kitchen-middens, which still remain on the shores of Denmark, and that the same or similar savages exhibited distinctly cannibal propensities in Scotland. It is also a matter of great curiosity to trace the mode in which the early Switzers constructed their lake dwellings, bringing with them from the East the precious jade stone, and trading as far as the shores of the Baltic for amber with which to decorate their persons. But I distinctly refuse to allow the piles on which their *crannogees* (as the Irish named such dwellings, which long held their ground there) were erected, to overthrow the foundations of my faith.

The narration of Genesis is in every way worthy of its Divine Author, and clearly narrates "man's first disobedience and the taste of that forbidden fruit," and gives us as noble an ancestry in tracing our descent from Adam, as on the other hand it is degrading to regard man as simply a developed ape having more brains than the rest of his bestial relations, but incomparably below them in morality. I have no pleasure in regarding such a creature as dominating over and destroying the far nobler creatures of God for some thousand centuries, and doing *nothing* worth remembrance, till at length he took it into his head to improve himself into man.

Perish all professed "science," if its object be to lead us back to heathenism, and to destroy in the hearts of mankind the only faith by which they can be elevated and saved!

### THE FROZEN RHINOCEROS FOUND IN SIBERIA.

"Je veux parler de ce *rhinocéros entier* trouvé au mois de decembre 1771, sur les bords du Wiluji, dans la région la plus froide de la Sibérie orientale et conservé, depuis tant de siècles, dans le sol glacé de cette terre inhabitable, avec sa peau, ses tendons, ses chairs, et dont Pallas lui-même vit encore au mois de

mars 1772, le crâne et les pieds revêtus de leur peau, de leurs ligaments, de leur tendons, et des fibres les plus grossières de leur chairs durcies.”—Flourens’ “Ontologie,” p. 270.

However great the preserving powers of a glacial climate, these remains can scarcely be assigned to a vast antiquity, since even the flesh remained; “*imo carnum duratarum grossiores, fibræ, velut in humidè naturalitè supererant*,” Pallas says in his report to the Academy of Sciences at St. Petersburg. Another observation which he makes with great apparent truth is that the catastrophe which destroyed these creatures must have been *sudden and most violent*, “*etiam violentissimam atque subitanèam fuisse*.”

I believe the accuracy of the observations of Pallas has never been called in question, and that some part of this old-world rhinoceros is still preserved in the museum at St. Petersburg.

### THE FLINT QUESTION.

I extract the following from the “Times” of a recent date:—

“Our readers are aware that last year a large space of ground near Pressigny-le-Grand, Indre-et-Loire, was discovered covered with an immense number of blocks of flint, bearing evidence of handiwork of some kind or other having been practised upon them. A number of archæologists, having visited the spot, came to the conclusion that this must have been a place where men of the primitive race, whether antediluvian (*anterior to the drift period*) or merely anteceltic, used to manufacture, on a large scale, those flint weapons and implements which, in the savage state of humanity at that *highly remote period*, constituted their whole mechanical stock. We subsequently informed our readers that M. Robert had sent a paper to the Academy of Sciences, in which he showed that these ‘flint implements’ were *merely the residues of a gun-flint manufactory* which had existed in those parts; and that on the occasion of a paper sent in by M. de Mortillet in refutation of M. Robert’s statement, M. Decaisne, President of the Academy, cut the matter short by declaring that there could be no doubt as to the correctness of M. Robert’s view on the matter. M. Penquilly Lharidon, director of the Museum of Artillery, now takes up the matter again in the ‘Moniteur,’ and adduces some arguments tending to invalidate M. Decaisne’s assertions, which, we

should mention, are founded on personal inquiry and inspection. On the other hand, M. Lharidon has in his favour a thorough knowledge of the history of firearms and of the manner in which gun-flints were manufactured. The first stones used for communicating sparks to gunpowder were not, he informs us, flints, but sulphuretted iron ore. The miquelet gun lock, of Spanish origin, was first introduced in 1630, but the stone, if flint, was used at that time, had not at all events been subjected to any manufacturing process. In 1703 firearms had undergone a complete metamorphosis. The soldier was armed with a musket, and it was his duty to find his own flints, which, however, he often used in their rough state; it was not until 1719 that gun-flints began to be regularly manufactured. All flints were not good for the purpose. That of Pressigny, which is coarse-grained, would not long have resisted the shock. The qualities required were great hardness, a fine grain, and a homogeneous consistency. The Archives of the Dépôt Central de l'Artillerie contain various reports, from which it appears that the localities where flints might be manufactured for the army were only selected after a rigorous inquiry into the qualities of the stone. These places were Meusnes, Couffy, Pouillé, Angé, Chantillion, Noyers, Langon, Lyes, Paulmey, Lucion, and Valencay. Meusnes was the central point where the artillery officer charged with the care of examining and accepting the gun-flints for the service was stationed. The only other places mentioned as giving good flints are Moyesse and St. Vincent (Ardèche), Gêrilly (Yonne), and La Roche Guyon (Oise). The qualities of flint found in the above-mentioned places were so good that their exportation was prohibited. Not a word is said of Pressigny in any of the documents alluded to. *M. Lharidon now proceeds to describe the way flints were manufactured. Three or four workmen used to join for the purpose; they would first dig a trench six feet long, six feet deep, and two feet broad, then another lower than this, and so on, like the parallels of a siege, till they got to the depth of thirty feet, or forty feet, where the flint pebbles lay in a sort of soft chalk. The tools used for chipping these flints consisted in three kinds of hammers, one of which ended in two steel points, and a chisel. Before chipping, the flints were externally dried by exposing them to the sun in fine weather, and to the fire in the cold and wet seasons. The workmen used to turn each*

pebble about in his hands till he could find a place where a single stroke would split it in two; the rest of the work consisted in chipping off bits and fashioning them with the chisel. The flint nuclei of Pressigny, our author adds, are much too large for them to have ever been chosen for this kind of work. Moreover, a gun-flint manufactory necessarily yielded an immense amount of small worthless chips, no trace of which is visible at Pressigny; and, lastly, if such blocks had ever been used for gun-flints, similar ones would still be found in the localities above mentioned, and yet this is not the case. Hence our author concludes that the stones of Pressigny were never manufactured into gun-flints."—*Galignani*.

"The most startling find of all, however, is that said to have occurred in the coal-mine of Ste.-Marie, near Charleroi, nothing less than a complete petrified human body of the diluvial period. We are told that it had been got out without breaking, with no injury beyond a slight fracture on one leg; that the teeth and hair are intact, and the nails of the fingers and great toes of fearful length; lastly, that as the body was found beneath a stratum of alluvial deposit ninety mètres thick, it represents in all probability a contemporary of the Deluge. M. Pasqué, a local apothecary and a celebrated French archæologist, who happened to be on the spot, but who, from motives of modesty, perhaps, seems to have suppressed his name, carefully washed our antique relative with a solution of sulphuric acid, and found a mass of shells attached to the dorsal region, which doubtless represent the inhabitants of those early waters which clung to the corpse as it floated to its resting-place. The fossil is said to be lying on view at the Café Industriel, close to the Porte of Waterloo. It has been hinted that the original announcement of this interesting discovery appeared on the 1st of April; but we do not wish to be sceptical, only cautious."—*Athenæum*, June 3, 1865.

Who can rest an opposition to revelation on facts which may be so differently interpreted?

The extreme abundance of flint arrow-heads, and weapons now discovered, would lead to strange conclusions, were it not evident that "those who hide can also find," and that the fabrication of these remains of pre-historic man may be a much more gainful speculation than would have been the case one hundred thousand years ago.

## E.

PAGE 155.

I refer for illustration of my meaning to an admirable paper which has just come under my notice, by Mr. Darwin, whose patient accuracy of observation is only equalled by the talent which he displays in conducting these observations. It is "On Climbing Plants," and is published in the last number of the "Journal of the Linnean Society."

In the concluding remarks, Mr. D. says—"Plants *become twiners, in order, it may be presumed to reach the light*, and to expose a large surface of leaves to its action and to that of the free air. This is effected by climbers with wonderfully little expenditure of organized matter, in comparison with trees, which have to support a load of heavy branches by a massive trunk. . . . If we inquire how the petiole of a leaf or the peduncle of a flower, or a branch first becomes and acquires the power of bending towards the touched side, *we get no certain answer*. Nevertheless . . . it would appear as if these plants had *utilized and perfected* a widely distributed and incipient *capacity*, which capacity, as far as we can see, is of no service to ordinary plants.

"It has often been vaguely asserted that plants are distinguished from animals by not having the power of movement. It should rather be said that plants acquire and display this power *only when it is of some advantage to them*, but that this is of comparatively rare occurrence, as they are affixed to the ground, and food is brought to them by the wind and rain. We see how high in organization a plant may rise, when we look at one of the more perfect tendril-bearers. It first places its tendrils ready for action, as a polypus places its tentacula. If the tendril be displaced, it is acted on by the force of gravity and rights itself. It is acted on by the light, and bends towards or from it, or disregards it, *whichever may be most advantageous*. During several days the tendril or internodes, or both, spontaneously revolve with a steady motion. The tendril strikes some object, and quickly curls round and firmly grasps it. In the course of some hours it contracts into a spire, dragging up the stem, and forming an excellent spring. *All movements now cease*. By growth the tissues soon become wonderfully

strong and durable. The tendril has done its work, and done it in an admirable manner.”—P. 118.

o. Again, in the observations on spiral twiners; “The *purpose* of the spontaneous revolving movement, or, more strictly speaking, of the continuous bending movement successively directed to all points of the compass, is as Mohl has remarked, obviously in part to favour the shoot finding a support. This is admirably effected by the revolutions carried on night and day, with a wider and wider circle swept as the shoot increases in length.”—P. 9.

“Many plants, which are not twiners, become in some degree twisted round their own axes, but this occurs so much more generally and strongly with twining plants than with other plants that there must be some connection between the capacity for twining and axial twisting. The most probable view, as it seems to me, is that the stem *twists itself to gain rigidity* (on the same principle that a much twisted rope is stiffer than a slackly twisted one), so as to be enabled either to pass over inequalities in its spiral ascent, or to carry its own weight when allowed to revolve freely.”—P. 6.

“This plant at first much perplexed me, for I continually observed its long and flexible shoots, evidently well fitted for twining, make a whole or quarter circle in one direction and then in the opposite direction, consequently when I placed the shoots near thin or thick stalks, or stretched string, they seemed perpetually to be trying to ascend these supports, but failed. . . Finally I surrounded another plant with many thin upright sticks, . . and now the *hibbertia* had got what it liked, for it twined up the parallel sticks, sometimes winding round one and sometimes round several. . . It would appear that this *hibbertia* is adapted to ascend by twining, and to ramble laterally over the thick Australian scrub.”—P. 21.

\*Referring to some plants which change from shrubs to creepers when transplanted to this country, Mr. D. says:—“These facts are highly remarkable; for there can hardly be a doubt that in the drier provinces of S. Africa these plants must have propagated themselves for thousands of generations in an erect condition, and yet during the whole period they have retained the innate power of spontaneously revolving and twining wherever their shoots become elongated under proper conditions of life.”—P. 25.

“*Bignonia unguis* is a leaf climber though possessing tendrils. Each leaf consists of a petiole bearing a pair of leaflets, and ter-









215/HOW



3203

